

# THE CLASSICAL REVIEW

DECEMBER 1944

## NOTES AND NEWS

THE Fortieth General Meeting of the Classical Association was held at St. Albans from 11 to 14 April, when a large gathering of members enjoyed the hospitality provided by the Council and Headmistress of the High School. The Presidential Address on 'Plato's Conception of Education and its Meaning for To-day' was given by Sir Walter Moberly. The Association was greeted at its first meeting by the Lord Bishop of St. Albans, and afterwards Dr. R. E. Pfeiffer read a paper on 'Erasmus and the Unity of the Classical and the Christian Renaissance'. Other papers were read on the two following days: by Mr. W. F. Jackson Knight on 'A Virgilian Sociology'; by Mr. F. W. Walbank on 'The Cause of Greek Decline'; by the Warden of Wadham on 'Homeric Methods of Composition'; by Professor J. D. Beazley on 'Etruscan Vases'; and by Professor F. E. Adcock on 'Women in Roman Life and Letters'. Two visits were arranged: one to the Abbey, by kind invitation of the Dean, who personally conducted one of the parties; the other to Verulamium, where the Curator of the Museum, Mr. P. Corder, acted as guide to the site and explained the principal discoveries. The Association was also most kindly received by the Mayor of St. Albans at the Town Hall. Perhaps the most purely enjoyable feature of the whole meeting was a dramatic performance by pupils of the High School of *Scenes from Greek Literature*, which won a well-deserved tribute from the Provost of King's College, Cambridge.

Instead of the Annual Dinner a luncheon was held at the High School, with the President in the chair. This informal function was marked by a happy speech from the Public Orator of the University of Cambridge, Captain W. C. K. Guthrie.

At the Business Meeting Dr. C. M. Bowra, Warden of Wadham College,

Oxford, was elected President for 1945. Afterwards a Symposium on 'Greek for Non-specialists' was opened by Mrs. Pym, who was followed by Miss Archibald, Mr. J. H. L. Lambart, and the Rev. A. D. Clarke. The subject was vigorously debated; and it is hoped that this and other topics bearing upon the practical teaching of Classics may be discussed at a conference later in the year.

Mr. W. F. J. Knight, Honorary Secretary of the Virgil Society, reports that the Society has now over three hundred members, and that several lectures have already been delivered to its branches. The Society was founded on 11 January 1943, under encouragement from the Classical Association with which it hopes to co-operate increasingly. Its first President is Mr. T. S. Eliot. It plans to spread a knowledge and enjoyment of the Classics and especially Virgil among members of many kinds, some of whom have not had the opportunity to develop their natural interest in Classical Antiquity. Among the members are some who are distinguished scholars, and others who know no Latin; others again are distinguished in departments of life remote from classical scholarship, but wish to continue or renew an interest surviving from a classical education.

Readers may be interested to learn that there is now available in the Classical Faculty Library at Cambridge a card index to all articles which have been published in the *Classical Review*, and that this index will be kept up to date. Articles are indexed both under authors' names and under subjects. Those who are unable to consult the index for themselves are invited to address inquiries to the Librarian, Classical Faculty Library, Mill Lane, Cambridge, enclosing a stamped addressed envelope for a reply.

## FOUR NOTES ON AESCHYLUS

(1) *Supplices* 306

τί οὖν ἔτευξε δ' ἄλλο δυσπότημο βοῖ;

WELLAUER and Kirchhoff accepted M's *ἔτευξε* δ', but almost all other editors have followed Turnebus with *ἔτευξεν*, even if they proposed other changes, such as Hermann's *τί δ'*; οὐκ ἔτευξεν . . . ;

I suggest that we have here one of the commonest of M's confusions, that of *δέ* for *τε*, and that what Aeschylus wrote was

τί οὖν ἔτευξ' ἔτ' ἄλλο . . . ;

and that *ἔτευξ' ἔτ'* had been misread as *ἔτευξέ τ'*, and then unconsciously changed to *ἔτευξε δ'*.

For this expression there are close parallels in l. 318

τίν' οὖν ἔτ' ἄλλον τῆσδε βλαστημὸν λέγεις;

and in *Cho.* 114

τίν' οὖν ἔτ' ἄλλον τῆδε προστιθῶ στάσει;

and I believe also in *Suppl.* 244, where Wellauer's correction of

καὶ τὰλλα πόλλ' ἐπεικάσαι δίκαιον ἦν

to *κατ' ἄλλα* . . . , which had occurred independently to me, seems a plain improvement.

(2) *Persae* 320 ff.

\* Ἀμστρίς Ἀμφιστρεὺς τε πολύπονον δόρυ  
νωμῶν, ὃ τ' ἐσθλὸς Ἀριόμαρδος Σάρδεσι  
πένθος παρασχών . . .

Porson marked a lacuna after *Ἀριόμαρδος*, and there have been many emendations, such as Wellauer's *ἄρρεσι*, but none is at all plausible. Most recent editors, including Wilamowitz and Murray, accept Hermann's view that this gross breach of Porson's law is excused by the fact that it occurs between two proper names. The defence may perhaps be sound, but it is difficult to find a real parallel for anything so gratuitous.

I suggest that Aeschylus wrote *Ἀσιδί*, a name for Asia which he uses alone in l. 763, and with *γη* and the like more than once in the play.

Duplication of the final *ς* of *Ἀριόμαρδος*, easy after *ο*, would produce *σασιδι*, and the transposition of *σ* and *δ*, with the influence of *-αρδ-* in *Ἀριόμαρδος*, would account for the rest.

An incidental advantage of this change would be that it would make it easier to reduce to three the four distinct holders of the name Ariomardus whom Cauer (in *Pauly-Wissowa*) finds in the army of Xerxes.

(3) *Agamemnon* 12 ff.

εὐτ' ἂν δὲ νυκτίπλεγκτον ἑνδροσόν τ' ἔχω  
εὐνήν δνείροις οὐκ ἐπισκοπούμενην  
ἐμήν φόβος γὰρ ἀνθ' ὕπνου παρασταεῖ,  
τὸ μὴ βεβαίως βλέφαρα συμβαλεῖν ὕπνω 15  
ὅταν δ' αἰδεῖται ἢ μινύρεσθαι δοκῶ,  
ὕπνου τόδ' ἀντίμολπον ἐντέμνων ἄκος,  
κλαίω τότ' οἴκου τοῦδε συμφορὰν στένων  
οὐχ ὡς τὰ πρόσθ' ἀρίστα διαπονούμενου.

The medical metaphor in l. 17 is obvious and acknowledged, but no one seems to have noticed that it is anticipated in the preceding lines. Headlam, indeed, in his prose translation printed 'Sleep' and 'Fear' with capitals, but he made no suggestion of the functions attributed to these personifications. Yet it seems clear that here, as in Sophocles, *Erigoni*, fr. 197 P., Sleep is the kindly physician—*ὕπνον ἱατρὸν νόσου*—and that Fear brutally drives him from the bedside. It is true that while both *προστατεῖν* and *ἐπιστατεῖν*, with patient or disease in the genitive, occur in the medical writers (e.g. in the Hippocratean *Precepts*, cc. 6 and 13), *παραστατεῖν* and connected words do not seem to be found in them; but these words have a wide range of meaning, and there are many examples of their use in connexion with sickness. It is enough to quote Sophocles, *Philoct.* 674 f. τὸ γὰρ | νοσοῦν ποθεῖ σε ξυμπαρ-  
*στάτην λαβεῖν* and Hierocles p. 54 Arnim (Stobaeus *flor.* 67. 24 = iv, p. 504, 20 Hense) οἷα δὲ δὴ ἐν νόσοις [οἷα] *παραστάτης* (sc. ἡ γυνή). Sophocles *O.C.* 559, where Theseus calls Antigone the *δύσμορος παραστάτης* of Oedipus, is of the same type. We also find *πάρεμμι* with the patient in the dative used of doctors and sick-nurses, for example in the passage of [Demosthenes] lix. 56 quoted below.

Further, the dreams of l. 13 are plainly personified, and their function too is clear: they are sick-nurses. This

is a t  
ἐπισκο  
often  
dictio  
and le  
a sick  
phon,  
ἀσθενή  
ἐπεσκο  
Mem.  
φίλου  
especi  
ζον γὰ  
ἦν το  
πρόσφ  
σκοπου  
ἀξία ἐ  
κάμνον  
liv. 12  
καὶ πα  
ἦς εἰς  
ἐλαβον  
μαρτυρ  
where  
medica  
the Ag  
seems  
of ἐπισ  
of a ca  
Hippoc  
(4) Ag  
Oxford  
ὁ τ  
ἐντο  
ισόσ  
ἴτος  
κατ  
στεῖ  
δ  
I wis  
part of  
The  
Aesch. Ag  
καὶ προ  
In *Pro*  
pp. 17-  
and Olo  
what is  
not a m  
applied

is a technical sense of ἐπισκοπεῖν and ἐπισκοπεῖσθαι, which in this connexion often mean not merely 'visit' (as the dictionaries translate them), but 'visit and look after' or simply 'look after' a sick person. So, for example, Xenophon, *Cyrop.* viii. 2. 25, καὶ ὅποτε δέ τις ἀσθενήσκει τῶν θεραπεύεσθαι ἐπικαιρίων, ἐπεσκόπει καὶ παρῖχε πάντα ὅτου ἔδει, and *Mem.* iii. 11. 10, καὶ ἀρρωστήσαντός γε φίλου φροντιστικῶς ἐπισκέψασθαι, and especially [Demosthenes] lix. 56, ἐβάδιζον γὰρ πρὸς αὐτόν, ὡς ἡσθένει καὶ ἔρημος ἦν τοῦ θεραπεύσοντος τὸ νόσημα, τὰ πρόσφορα τῇ νόσῳ φέρουσαι καὶ ἐπισκοπούμεναι· ἵστε δῆπου καὶ αὐτοὶ ὅσου ἀξία ἐστὶ γυνὴ ἐν ταῖς νόσοις, παρούσα κάμνοντι ἀνθρώπῳ, and Demosthenes, *liv.* 12 ὡς οὖν καὶ ταῦτ' ἀληθῆ λέγω, καὶ παρηκολούθησέ μοι τοιαύτη νόσος, ἐξ ἧς εἰς τοῦσχατον ἦλθον, ἐξ ὧν ὑπὸ τούτων ἔλαβον πληγῶν, λέγε τὴν τοῦ ἱατροῦ μαρτυρίαν καὶ τὴν τῶν ἐπισκοποῦντων, where the context shows that strictly medical evidence is being given.

It may be added that l. 1248 of the *Agamemnon*

ἀλλ' οὔτι παῖων τῷδ' ἐπιστατεὶ λόγῳ

seems to show the same technical use of ἐπιστατεῖν, for the physician in charge of a case, which I have mentioned as Hippocratican.

(4) *Agamemnon* 76 ff. (I print Murray's Oxford text)

ὃ τε γὰρ νεαρὸς μυελὸς στέφανον  
ἐντὸς ἀνάσσειν  
ἰσόπρεσβος, "Ἀρης δ' οὐκ ἐνὶ χώρᾳ,  
†τόθι περ γήρως φυλλάδος ἦδη  
κατακαρφομένης τρίποδας μὲν ὁδοὺς  
στείχει, παιδὸς δ' οὐδὲν ἀρείων  
ὄναρ ἡμερόφαντον ἀλαίνει.

I wish to discuss here only the latter part of l. 78, "Ἀρης δ' οὐκ ἐνὶ χώρᾳ.

The manuscript tradition is pre-

dominantly for ἐν (= ἐνεσσι), though M has ἐνι, and the impossibility, in tragic anapaests, of treating the word as ἐνί (= ἐν) was implicitly recognized by all the early editors, and explicitly asserted by Hermann against Boissonade's proposal to follow Ven. 468 in reading ἐνὶ χώρᾳ. It was left to Kirchhoff, Verrall, Headlam, and Thomson to print and defend this reading without even raising the question of the legitimacy of the use.

Nevertheless Hermann and others have rightly felt that χώρᾳ is an awkward appendage to the self-sufficient words "Ἀρης δ' οὐκ ἐνι, so well matched by the οὐκ ἐνεσσι "Ἀρης of *Suppl.* 749.

Many emendations have been proposed, but none is convincing, and I would suggest another, which involves practically no change, and produces excellent sense: "Ἀρης δ' οὐκ ἐνὶ χώρᾳ (= "Ἀρης δὲ καὶ ὦρα οὐκ ἐνεσις).

The arrangement of the words is unusual, but not really difficult. I have found no exact parallel, but a similar freedom in the handling of paired negations is common in Aeschylus: for instance, *P.V.* 172 ff.

καὶ μ' οὔτι (οὔτοι M) μελιγλώσσοις πειθοῦς  
ἐπαυδαῖσιν θέλει, στερεάς τ'  
οὔποτ' ἀπειλὰς πτήξας τόδ' ἐγὼ  
καταμηνύσω.

*Sept.* 399

λόφοι δὲ κώδων τ' οὐ δάκνουσ' ἀνευ δορός.

*Agam.* 228

λιτὰς δὲ καὶ κληδόνας πατρῶους  
παρ' οὐδὲν αἰῶνα παρθένειόν (τ')  
ἔθεντο φιλόμαχοι βραβῆς.

*Eum.* 389

τίς οὖν τάδ' οὐχ ἄξεσται  
τε καὶ δέδοικεν βροτῶν . . . ;

D. S. ROBERTSON.

Trinity College, Cambridge.

## BAD BRONZE

Aesch. *Ag.* 390-3 κακοὶ δὲ χαλκοῦ τρόπον τρίβῳ τε καὶ προσβολαῖς μελαμπαγῆς πέλει δικαιοθεῖς.

In *Proc. Brit. Acad.*, vol. xxviii, pp. 17-18 ('Aeschylus: New Texts and Old Problems') after arguing that what is needed in Aeschylean studies 'is not a new creed, Marxist or another, applied to, or enforced upon, the work

of the poet, but observation, more observation, and ever more observation', Professor Fraenkel writes of the passage quoted above: 'Some interpreters have attempted to blunt the edge of the phrase by using non-committal circumlocutions, others to persuade us that χαλκός may mean "gold",

which is of course impossible. Those who do not play such tricks produce something like this: "Like to false bronze betrayed by touch of sure-testing stone" (Prof. G. Thomson). Was ever a Greek half-witted enough to believe that you could test bronze with the touchstone, βάσανος? And what about the alleged meaning of the word δικαιοῦν, which seems quite inconsistent with its well-known usage? . . . What the passage really means was perfectly understood by William Sewell. . . . "And unto brass adulterate like, blackened with bruise and many a blow, to sentence he is brought."

If the idea of the touchstone is to be excluded, what is the point of the simile? In what sense is the sinner, blackened and bruised and brought to sentence, comparable with bad bronze? That is the root of the problem. Sewell's rendering does not touch it. Professor Fraenkel raises it, then abruptly throws it aside. Headlam's interpretation, which I accepted, is admittedly inadequate, but, as I shall now try to show, it was a step in the right direction and sound as far as it goes.

Gold was assayed in ancient times by rubbing it on the so-called *Λυδία λίθος*, which, if the metal was impure, left a black streak (Bacch. fr. 10, Theog. 449-51). This process inspired the traditional image of the unrighteous man or false friend whose true nature is revealed by Time the touchstone. The relevant passages have been collected by Headlam. But there is no evidence that χαλκός (copper, bronze, brass) was, or could be, tested in this way. Why then have we χαλκοῦ here instead of χρυσοῦ?

A similar problem is raised by another passage (611-12), οὐδ' οἶδα τέριμν οὐδ' ἐπίφογον φάτιν ἄλλον πρὸς ἀνδρὸς μάλλον ἢ χαλκοῦ βαφάς. Clytemnestra is pretending to have been an exemplary wife: 'I know no more of delight or disrepute at the hands of other men than I know of—tempering steel.' That is what we should say in English, but the Greek says 'tempering bronze'. The process of tempering iron by heating it in the fire and then plunging it in water (*Od.* 9. 391-3) is still familiar,

but no art of tempering bronze is known to modern metallurgy. It has been described as a 'lost art', but according to W. Gowland ('Ancient Bronze', *The Mining Magazine*, vii. 458-9) it never existed. 'In the old days', he says, 'the bronze castings for tools, weapons, etc., were hammered at the cutting edges to produce the right degree of hardness and temper. No other method was employed, such as heat treatment.'

There is very little in ancient literature to set on the other side: Antiphon 40 Diels = Poll. 7. 169 Ἀντιφῶν δὲ εἶρηκε βάψιν χαλκοῦ καὶ σιδήρου, Virg. G. 4. 172-3 stridentia tingunt aera lacu, Procl. ad Hes. Op. 142 καὶ τῷ χαλκῷ πρὸς τοῦτο (sc. ὅπλων κατασκευὴν) ἐχρῶντο, ὡς τῷ σιδήρῳ πρὸς γεωργίαν, διὰ τινος βαφῆς τὸν χαλκὸν στερεοποιούντες, ὅντα φύσει μαλακόν. From the context in Pollux it appears that Antiphon did not mean tempering at all, but painting; Virgil follows Aeschylus; and Proclus is misled by the poets. The scholiast's paraphrase of Aeschylus is noteworthy: ὥσπερ οὐκ οἶδα τὰς βαφὰς τοῦ σιδήρου, οὕτως οὐδὲ ἡδονὴν ἑτέρου ἀνδρός. He takes 'bronze' simply as a poetical substitute for 'iron'.

Why should the poets have described bronze as though it was iron? Not because they were ignorant or half-witted. In their day weapons were made of iron, but the epic tradition, derived from the Bronze Age, was so strong that χαλκεύς became the accepted term for any kind of smith (*Od.* 9. 391) and χαλκός persisted in poetry as the metal of arms and armour: Alcaeus 54, Simon. 144, Pind. I. 3. 33, 6. 25, N. 1. 16, etc. Aeschylus himself describes the battle of Salamis as though it has been fought with bronze (*Per.* 408 χαλκήρη στόλον, 456-7 εὐχάλοισι ὅπλοισι), and Pindar characterizes iron by a contradiction in terms (oxymoron) as πολὺ χαλκῷ (*P.* 3. 48, 11. 20), the epithet being transferred from *Il.* 9. 366 πολὺν τε σιδήρον, cf. *P.* 3. 48 sch. τῷ πολὺ καὶ λαμπρῷ σιδήρῳ, where χαλκῷ is explained correctly but not πολὺ. Similarly in

χαλκο  
tage  
χαλκ  
a we  
water  
δίθηκ  
Re  
we se  
to br  
mind  
by th  
(389)  
which  
(395 π  
818 κ  
πόλις,  
from a  
would  
of tin  
of the  
92 Dic  
τοιούτ  
ὥσπερ  
κόν).  
protect  
Nauck  
εὐπρεπ  
in the  
Why  
brings  
the me  
Fraen  
(p. 17)  
out'?  
μέλαν  
and t  
πῆγνυμ  
'conge  
διαρρ  
πῆγνυμ  
the col  
μελαμπ  
other p  
Just as  
friction  
bronze  
self ag  
of his  
own bl  
And  
δικαιωθ  
detur  
So far  
warran  
Fraenk



χαλκοῦ βαφάς Aeschylus takes advantage of this conventional association of χαλκός with weapons of war to suggest a weapon that is to be steeped not in water, like iron, but in blood: *P.V.* 863 διθήκτον ἐν σφαγαῖσι βάψασα ξίφος.

Returning to the passage before us, we see it in a new light. The allusion to bronze reminds us, if we need reminding, that Paris has been punished by the Trojan War. The φῶς αἰνολαμπές (389) is the blaze of the burning city, which he has involved in his own ruin (395 πόλει πρόστριμμα θεῖς ἄφερτον), cf. 818 καπνῷ δ' ἄλοῦσα νῦν ἔτ' εὖσημος πόλις, *Eur. Tr.* 1295 λέλαμπεν Ἴλιος. Now from a military point of view bad bronze would be copper with a low percentage of tin and hence too soft, for the effect of the alloy is to harden it (*Emped.* 92 Diels = *Arist. G.A.* 2. 8. 3 ἐκ δὲ τῶν τοιούτων γίνεσθαι ἐκ μαλακῶν σκληρόν, ὥσπερ τῷ καττιτέρῳ μειχθέντα τὸν χαλκόν). Good bronze, therefore, was a protection in time of need: *Soph. fr.* 780 Ναυκ λᾶμπει γὰρ ἐν χρεῖαισιν ὥσπερ εὐπρεπὴς χαλκός. Bad bronze would fail in the test of battle.

Why then does it turn black? This brings me to another point. What is the meaning of μελαμπαγής? Professor Fraenkel translates 'black throughout' (p. 17). But how does he get 'throughout'? In view of the common phrase μέλαν αἶμα (1020, 1510-11, *Eum.* 183, 980) and the equally common usage of πήγνυμαι in the sense of 'freeze' or 'congeal' (*Cho.* 67 τίτας φόνος πέπηγεν οὐ διαρρύναν, *Plut. Cim.* 18 τοῦ δ' αἵματος τὸ πηγνύμενον), the reference is surely to the colour of congealed blood, *Sept.* 737 μελαμπαγὲς αἶμα. (This is the only other passage in which the word occurs.) Just as base gold turns black under the friction of the touchstone, so the bad bronze in which the sinner arms himself against the assaults (προσβολαῖς) of his enemies is blackened with his own blood.

And so he is brought to justice, δικαιωθείς. 'In hoc loco δικαιωθείς videtur significare probatus' Blomfield. So far from being an example of 'unwarranted traditionalism', as Professor Fraenkel asserts, this comment is quite

correct. In general δικαιοῦν is to 'bring to justice' or 'punish', but here, in reference to the simile, it stands for βασανισθεῖς, 'brought to the test'. And, what is more, it is designed to recall the proverb on which, as Headlam saw, the whole sentence depends: *Soph. OT.* 614 χρόνος δίκαιον ἄνδρα δείκνυσιν μόνος, *Pind. fr.* 159 ἀνδρῶν δικαίων χρόνος σωτήρ ἄριστος, *Chaeremon ap. Stob. Ecl. Phys.* 1. 8. 28, p. 98 W. χρόνος δίκαιον ἄνδρα μηνύει ποτέ. The language of Aeschylus is not to be measured by the dictionary.

I suggest therefore that the proper scholium on these lines would have been μαστιγοῦνται δικαιοῦν, ὑπὸ τοῦ χρόνου δηλονότι, χαλκοῦ τρόπον κακοῦ ὅς μελαίνεται προσβολαῖς ταῖς τῶν πολεμίων αἵματόμενος ὥσπερ τριβῇ χρυσός. Aeschylus began with the proverbial image of Time the touchstone, but, as he envisaged the battlefield, the blackened gold was transmuted into bloodstained bronze as a symbol of the castigated criminal, who was in fact slain in battle.

This is language at a very high tension, and only intelligible because the proverb was so familiar. But Aeschylus is full of these imaginative conceits, φωνάεντα συνετοῖσιν, and, granted the traditional background, without which he cannot be understood at all, the present instance is not more difficult than 104-5 ὄδιον κράτος αἰσίων ἀνδρῶν ἐκτελέων, where, since the eagles are the kings, ὄδιον τέρας αἰσίων αἰετῶν is merged with κράτος ἀνδρῶν ἐκτελέων, i.e. βασιλέων, in allusion to the eagle as king of birds: *Il.* 24. 310-15 πέμψον δ' οἰωνόν, ἐὼν ἄγγελον, ὅς τε σοὶ αὐτῷ φίλτατος οἰωνῶν, καὶ εὐ κράτος ἐστὶ μέγιστον . . . ὥς ἔφατ' εὐχόμενος, τοῦ δ' ἔκλυε μητίετα Ζεὺς, αὐτίκα δ' αἰετὸν ἦκε, τελειότατον πετεηνῶν (see my note).

This poet was certainly not lacking in wit, rather the reverse, περισσόφρων, and there is more in him than met William Sewell's eye. Let me conclude therefore by subscribing to Professor Fraenkel's appeal for 'more observation'.

GEORGE THOMSON.

University of Birmingham.

## ΟΦΡΥΣ

(Theocr. *Id.* xxx. 7 f.)

Look up the word *ὄφρυς* in L. and S. and you will find the meaning *brow*, *eyebrow*, the derivative meaning *scorn*, *pride*, and a number of passages in which the word is applied to things which rim or overhang much as the supra-orbital ridge overhangs the eye-cavity. Turn to Stephanus and you will get no farther, nor, so far as I am aware, has ancient scholarship anything to add, yet there are passages in Greek poetry to which none of these meanings is applicable.

When the satyrs at Eur. *Cycl.* 657 encourage each other with the words *ὠθεῖτε, σπείδετε, | ἐκκαίετε τὰν ὄφρυν | θηρὸς τοῦ ξενοδαίτα* it is the eye not the eyebrow of the Cyclops they are burning out, as both the context and common sense abundantly prove. At Aesch. *Ch.* 285 *ὄρωντα λαμπρὸν ἐν σκότῳ νωμῶντ' ὄφρυν*, whatever the relation of that line to its context, the meaning *eye*, in any case probable, is certain if Bothe's correction *λαμπρὰν* is right: certain too at Eur. *Alc.* 261 *ὕπ' ὄφρυσιν κυαναγέσι | βλέπων πτερωτός* unless Monk's *κυαναγές* is to be accepted. And since, whatever may be thought of the last two passages, the first proves that *ὄφρυς* (like *βλέφαρον*) sometimes denoted the eye, here may be mentioned the passages in which *ὄφρυες* are used in smiling. They are these: *Hom. Hymn.* 2. 358 *μεῖδῃσεν δὲ ἄναξ ἐνέρων Ἀιδωνεύς | ὄφρυσιν*,<sup>1</sup> *Pind. P.* 9. 38 *ἀγανῆ χλοαρὸν γελάσσας ὄφρυι*, *Ap. Rh.* 3. 1024 *ἡμερόεν φαιδρῆσιν ὑπ' ὄφρυσιν μειδιῶντες*, and perhaps (for the text has been a good deal suspected) *Hermesianax fr.* 7.9 *Ποῦλ. Κωκυτὸν τ' ἀθέμιστον ἐπ' ὄφρυσιν μειδῆσαντα*. 'Many expressions', says Tucker (on Aesch. *Ch.* 285) truly enough, 'testify to great and habitual play of the eyebrows among the Greeks' (cf. *Poll.* 2. 49), but when L. and S., citing the first two of these passages, remark 'the brow was also the seat of smiles and joy', I find it hard to believe them. Contraction of the brows indicates

anger, their relaxation its absence, for *ἐξ ὄφρυν καὶ γαλήνη προσώπων ἀναφαίνεται καὶ τὸ ἀντίπαλον* (Eustath. 1538. 12). When Hera at *Il.* 15. 101, failing to conceal her temper, *ἐγέλασε | χεῖλεσιν, οὐδὲ μέτωπον ἐπ' ὄφρυσιν κυανέησιν | ἰάνθη*, it is the lingering signs of anger in her brow, not the absence of their opposite, which betray her, for Greeks smiled, as any human being must, not with *μέτωπον* but with *πρόσωπον* (e.g. *Sapph. fr.* 1. 14, *Plat. Euthyd.* 275 E), or, where specific features are mentioned, with lips, eyes (e.g. *Theocr.* 7. 20), or cheeks (*Theocr.* 30. 4): and since *ὄφρυες* can denote one of these, I suggest that that is what the word does denote when used of smiling.<sup>1</sup> Herodian, it may be mentioned, derived the word from *ὄραν*.<sup>2</sup>

There is another passage in which *eyebrow* is no less absurd than in Eur. *Cycl.* 657. *Dikaiopolis* at *Ar. Ach.* 17 says *οὐδεπώπορ' ἐξ ὄτου γὰρ ῥύπτομαι | οὕτως ἐδήχθη ὑπὸ κονίας τὰς ὄφρυς | ὡς νῦν*, and it is not the eyebrows but the eyes, or perhaps rather their lids, which are irritated by the alkali of soap or lye. And here may be mentioned some other places where the meaning *brow*, though not impossible, is not at all apt. An intelligent schoolboy who did not know the meaning of *ὄφρυς*, if confronted with *Il.* 14. 236 *κοίμησόν μοι Ζηνὸς ὑπ' ὄφρυσιν ὅσσε φαεινῶ*, or with the dying Adonis whose eyes in *Bion* 1. 10 *ὕπ' ὄφρυσιν ναρκῇ*, or with one of the passages where people shed tears *ὕπ' ὄφρυσιν* (*Il.* 13. 88, *Od.* 4. 153, 8. 86, 531, 16. 219), would guess it to mean *eyelid*: and he might appeal to the authority of Jebb whose version of *τέγγει ὑπ' ὄφρυσιν παγκλαυτοῖς δειράδας* at *Soph. Ant.* 830 is *beneath her weeping lids the tears bedew her bosom*.

<sup>1</sup> The meaning *brow* can be retained, though with some detriment to the sense, at *Ap. Rh.* 3. 1024 by taking *ὄφρυν* with the noun, not with the participle; and in *Hermesianax* by altering *ἐπὶ* to *ὕπὸ* (with Ruhnken) and treating it similarly. For this alteration there is in any case something to be said.

<sup>2</sup> 2. 294. 4 L. (= *Et. M.* 644. 32, where other ancient guesses will be found).

<sup>1</sup> Cf. *C.R.* xxxi. 120.

I think, therefore, that there is a plain case for adding *eye*,<sup>1</sup> and a plausible case for adding *eyelid*, to the occasional meanings of *ὄφρυς*. And this brings me to the passage which led me to investigate the word—Theocr. 30. 7 *ἐχθὲς γὰρ παριῶν ἔδρακε λεπτὰ μελιφρύγων | αἰδεσθεῖς ποτὶδην<sup>2</sup> ἀντίος, ἡρεῦθεο δὲ χροά*.

The lines, lost from p. Ant., depend on a single manuscript, and Bergk's correction, *ἄμμε δι' ὄφρύων* has been generally accepted, though some would trust the manuscript for an Aeolic form *ὄφρύγων*: and *δι' ὄφρύ(γ)ων* at least seems to impose itself.<sup>3</sup> But Legrand, who translates *il m'a lancé un mince regard à travers ses sourcils*, very pertinently adds *en français nous dirions plutôt: 'à travers ses cils'*, and it is useless for Cholmeley to adduce a Russian phrase meaning *to glance from under the brow*, for *διά* does not mean *from under*. And though I have seen eyebrows whose owners could, at a pinch, look through them, I have yet to meet a boy so equipped. To be brief, the meaning *eyebrow* seems to me here impossible, the meaning *eye* possible.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The absurdity of *eyebrow* has already driven some translators to this rendering, e.g. Fraccaroli and Wade-Gery and Bowra in Pindar, Starkie in Aristophanes.

<sup>2</sup> At 24 the MS. has unmetrically *ποτ' ἐμὸν*, and Bergk, followed by most editors, wrote *ποτ'*. Edmonds, followed by Legrand, here writes *ποτὶδην*. The Aeolic form of the preposition, however, is *πρός*, and Hoffmann was presumably right in restoring it in both places.

<sup>3</sup> The plural *ἄμμε* is (to me at least) somewhat unwelcome in this context. Hoffmann wrote *λέπτα με*, which goes some way beyond the other instances of anomalous lengthening in T.'s Aeolic poems but is not necessarily to be condemned for that reason. Since, however, it is a single glance which the boy gives, *λέπτον με* might be considered.

<sup>4</sup> But not attractive. *Διά* I should then suppose

the meaning *eyelid*, if permissible, much preferable. The lines will then, except in the choice of adjective, resemble Ibyc. fr. 2 *Ἔρος αὐτὲ με κυανέουσιν ὑπὸ βλεφάροις τακέρ' ὀμμασι δερκόμενος | κηλήμασι παντοδαποῖς ἐς ἄπειρα | δίκτυα Κύπριδος με βάλλει*—a passage usually cited as a parallel, and very possibly the original in T.'s mind. The glance is through half-closed lids, and so in effect *à travers ses cils*—unless indeed *ὄφρυες* actually means *eyelashes*.

Finally a word on the adjective. Bergk wrote *λόξ' ἄμμε δι' ὄφρύων* (from *Id.* 20. 13), but Theodore Fritzsche cited Eur. *Or.* 223, where Orestes says *αὐχμῶδη κόμην | ἄφελε προσώπου, λεπτὰ γὰρ λεύσσω κόραις*, and since then this adjective has been generally accepted. No doubt rightly: but the parallel is in some respects misleading. The scholiast understood Orestes to mean *ἀσθενῆ γὰρ λεύσσω ταῖς κόραις διὰ τὸ ἐπικεῖσθαί μοι τὰς τρίχας*, and there is some superficial resemblance between Orestes looking through his dishevelled hair and the boy looking *δι' ὄφρύων*. But in the first place it is not plain that the scholiast was right, for Orestes has just said (219) *ἐξόμορξον ἀθλίον | στόματος ἀφρώδη πέλανον ὀμμάτων τ' ἐμῶν*, and may well mean 'brush the hair from my eyes for illness has impaired my sight'. And in the second, in Euripides *λεπτά*, on either view, means *ἀσθενῆ*, but in T. it cannot: there the boy, who is shy rather than ashamed, gives him a quick glance as they pass and looks away—but there is no reason why *λέπτα* (or *λέπτον*) should not have that meaning.

A. S. F. Gow.

Trinity College, Cambridge.

to be instrumental, and the phrase equivalent to the common *ὀφθαλμοῖς* or *ὀμμασι* added superfluously to verbs of seeing.

## TWO NOTES ON TACITUS

### I. 'Coloniae et municipia' in the Dialogus

THE Tacitean use of *coloniae et municipia*, without further specification, to denote Italian, as contrasted with provincial, cities has been fully established

by H. J. Cunningham (*C.Q.* 1914, 132; 1915, 57) and H. M. Last (*J.R.S.* 1932, 232; 1934, 59). Both the *Historiae* and the *Annals* have been thoroughly searched for passages in which these words occur. But the *Dialogus* also contains a number of references to *coloniae et municipia*

worth investigating for their bearing on this question.

(1) iii. 4. Marcus Aper, the Gallic orator, is reproaching Curiatius Maternus, the poet-pleader, with neglecting oratory for the writing of tragedies: 'adeo te tragoediae istae non satiant, quo minus omissis orationum et causarum studiis omne tempus modo circa Medeam, ecce nunc circa Thyestem consumas, cum te tot amicorum causae, tot *coloniæ et municipiorum clientelae* in forum vocent'. Here *coloniae et municipia* are unspecified: the context, however, suggests that the neglected *clientelae* are Italian, for Aper goes on to complain that Maternus is degrading Roman names and history by tacking them on to 'Greekings' legends: 'quibus vix suffeceris, etiam si non novum tibi ipse negotium importasses, ut Domitium et Catonem, id est nostras quoque historias et Romana nomina, Graeculorum fabulis adgregares'. Pleading of provincial cases is explicitly mentioned by Aper in a later chapter (v. 3): 'natus ad eloquentiam . . . qua . . . complecti provincias possit (sc. Maternus)'.

(2) vii. 4. No other profession, Aper maintains, is so productive of a great name and reputation for those who pursue it as is that of oratory: 'advenae quoque et peregrini iam in *municipiis et coloniis suis* auditos, cum primum urbem attigerunt, requirunt ac velut agnoscere concupiscunt'. Here *advenae* and *peregrini* indicate visitors from a distance, including non-citizens, i.e. non-Italians, while *municipiis* and *coloniis* are qualified by *suis*. The towns are, then, in this case, clearly specified as provincial.

(3) xx. 4. Aper is describing how young students of the rhetorical schools of Rome are in the habit of taking home with them arresting and remarkable utterances of their masters, and of passing on to one another, from mouth to mouth, and, in the case of students not domiciled in Rome, of quoting in their home-letters, some brilliant idea expressed in terse and pointed epigrammatic phrases or some striking passage of choice and poetic

beauty: 'iam vero iuvenes et in ipsa studiorum incude positi, qui profectus sui causa oratores sectantur, non solum audire, sed etiam referre domum aliquid illustre et dignum memoria volunt; traduntque in vicem ac saepe in *coloniae ac provincias suas scribunt*, sive sensus aliquis arguta et brevi sententia effulsit, sive locus exquisito et poetico cultu enituit'. Here *coloniae* are distinguished as Italian cities from *provinciae*, as in *Ann.* iii. 55: 'novi homines e municipiis et coloniis atque etiam provinciis in senatum crebro adsumpti'.

(4) xxxix. 4. Messalla is describing the crowded audiences before which republican orators had pleaded: 'qualia cotidie antiquis oratoribus contingebant, cum tot pariter ac tam nobiles forum coarent, cum *clientelae* quoque ac tribus et *municipiorum etiam legationes* ac pars Italiae periclitantibus adisteret'. Here the word *municipia*, unqualified and juxtaposed to *pars Italiae*, clearly denotes Italian cities.

(5) xli. 2. Maternus is arguing that crime is the essential material of oratory: 'quis enim nos advocat nisi aut nocens aut miser? *quod municipium in clientelam nostram venit*, nisi quod aut vicinus populus aut domestica discordia agitat? *quam provinciam tuemur nisi spoliata vexatamque?*' here again *municipium*, unspecified and contrasted with *provincia*, must denote an Italian city.

Thus all the passages in the *Dialogus* alluding to *coloniae et municipia* fully support the conclusion drawn from parallel passages in the *Historiae* and *Annales*, namely that the words when used without further specification denote the country towns of Italy as contrasted with provincial cities.

## II. 'urgentibus imperii fatis', Germania 33

Of these well-known words J. G. C. Anderson (*Cornelii Taciti de Origine et Situ Germanorum* (1938), 163) writes: 'In itself the phrase might be neutral: the goal towards which the Empire is being driven might be either world-rule or destruction (or at least calamity). But the context leaves no room for



doubt that the *fata* are, as usual, *acerba*: "it has come to this, that Fortune can vouchsafe no greater boon than discord among our foes". The object of this note is to question the finality of this verdict and to plead once again for 'world-rule' as the correct interpretation of *fata* in the passage before us.

First for the context. Is it really so decisive? Ch. 33 begins with an account of how the Bructeri had been driven out of their territory and cut to pieces by the concerted action of the neighbouring tribes, 'seu superbiae odio seu praedae dulcedine seu favore quodam erga nos deorum'. For over 60,000 tribesmen were slain 'non armis telisque Romanis, sed, quod magnificentius est, oblectationi oculisque' ('as a feast for Roman eyes'). Then Tacitus continues with the famous sentence: 'maneant, quaeque durent gentibus, si non amor nostri, at certe odium sui, quando *urgentibus imperii fatis* nihil iam praestare fortuna maius potest quam hostium discordiam.' According to the *Germania* the German tribesmen possess just those qualities, and in particular that *virtus*, which made up the *mores antiqui* of ancient Rome and which the modern Romans of Tacitus' own day to so large an extent had lost; and the satiric implication of this passage is that, owing to the loss of those qualities by Rome, her hope of success against the Germans lies, at the moment, not in her arms, but in their divisions (cf. *Agr.* 32 (Calgacus' speech): 'nostris illi dissensionibus ac discordiis clari vitia hostium in gloriam exercitus sui vertunt'). Rome must return to her *mores antiqui*, to her one-time *virtus*, if she is to cope successfully with Germany. But the *fata* which lie behind the need for such coping are not necessarily calamity or disaster. *Fata* in the sense of destiny for world-dominion equally suits the context. Such *fata* demand *virtus*: and, should this interpretation prove to be the right one after all, we should have here an instance of the familiar Tacitean *stasis* or dilemma. Rome is destined to world-conquest, yet she has, for the time at least, for-

gotten those qualities which make world-conquest possible. Similarly in the *Agricola* it is clear that Tacitus believed that Agricola's true mission was to reach with his arms to the farthest boundaries of the world; yet the civilization which his conquests bring with them only destroys what is best in the subjugated peoples and makes them docile for slavery (*Agr.* 30-2; cf. 21).

We must now examine the arguments for equating *fata* here with world-dominion. G. Andresen, whose review, in *Woch. kl. Phil.* 1915, 755, of R. Reitzenstein's *Bemerkungen zu den kleinen Schriften des Tacitus* (1914) Anderson follows, quotes various passages from Virgil and Livy in which *fatum* or *fata* is coupled with *urgere* to express the idea that an evil fate is crushing, or pressing down hard upon, a person or persons, or upon the state, and goading them to disaster or ruin. He prefers to see the prototype of our Tacitean phrase in these passages, rather than in Lucan's lines on Alexander, which Reitzenstein quotes:

perque Asiae populos fatis urgentibus actus  
humana cum strage ruit. (x. 30-1)

Andresen rejects the parallel between Tacitus' *urgentibus imperii fatis* and the Lucan passage as too complicated, because he assumes that it postulates a double function for Tacitus' *urgentibus*: (1) fate is overtaking the German peoples ('über die Germanen will das *fatum* hereinbrechen'), (2) fate is driving the Romans on ('diejenige (sc. Funktion) die Lukan durch *actus* ausdrückt'). But this complication is at once removed, and the parallel made perfectly clear, if we reject Andresen's assumption that 'hier bedeute *fata urgentia* das Geschick nicht Alexanders, sondern Asiens'. Why should not the *fata* be Alexander's destiny, driving him on to world-dominion, a destiny which is his own, though it may have brought the disaster of conquest to the Asiatic peoples? There are, of course, numerous well-known passages in Virgil in which *fatum* or *fata* denotes, not disaster, but destiny, whether in conjunction with *actus* (e.g. *Aen.* i. 32; vii. 223-4) or without it (e.g. *Aen.* i. 205-6,



546; vi. 147; viii. 477). So, too, in Tacitus himself we find such uses as 'occulta fati' (*Hist.* i. 10); 'nihil arduum fatis' (*Hist.* ii. 82); 'tantam fatorum magnitudinem' (*Hist.* v. 13); *fatum* = *μοῖρα* (*Ann.* vi. 22); while in 'principium interno simul externoque bello parantibus fatis' (*Hist.* ii. 69) *fata* seems to partake of the meanings both of destiny and of evil fate. Again, *urgere* in Tacitus, while sometimes used for 'to crush' or 'to press down hard upon', as in 'urgentium malorum' (*Ann.* iv. 66), also denotes 'to urge on' or 'to drive forward' or 'to work upon', as in 'urgentibus etiam mathematicis' (*Hist.* i. 22); 'urgere modestiam senatus' (*Ann.* ii. 38); 'festinare et urgere, ut provinciam, ut legiones solus habeat' (*Ann.* ii. 70); 'urgente Agrippa' (*Ann.* vi. 4); 'urgentibusque Agrippinae minis' (*Ann.* xiii. 15); 'dein, postquam urgebatur, confessionis gloriam amplexus' (*Ann.* xv. 67); while 'urgens dominatio' (*Ann.* v. 3) can be variously interpreted as 'crushing' (Furneaux), 'grinding' (Jackson), 'unrelenting' (Ramsay) or even, possibly, as a lust for power which goads Tiberius and Sejanus on.

There would seem, then, to be no valid reason, from the point of view of Latinity, against translating *urgentibus imperii fatis* as 'since the destiny of Empire is urging us on', rather than as 'since fate is pressing hard upon the Empire', or 'driving the Empire to disaster'. No one would deny Andresen's contention that when a person, or thing, is found depending in the genitive case on *fatum* or *fata* it often denotes 'diejenige Person, die das Schicksal trifft'. But if *fata* can mean 'destiny' and *urgere* 'urge on', there is surely no need to maintain, with Andresen and Anderson, that *urgentibus imperii fatis* is exactly equivalent to what, in fact, Tacitus has *not* written, i.e. *urgentibus imperium fatis*, and to construe accordingly.

We must now turn to the historical aspect of our problem. Against the interpretation of our phrase which we are attempting to defend, and against the whole idea that Tacitus advocated a resumption of the conquest of Ger-

many, certain psychological and political objections have been raised. Wight Duff (*Literary History of Rome in the Silver Age*, 575) objects that, had Tacitus had any such idea in view, he would have avowed it openly. To this it may be replied that it is by no means always Tacitus' way to give an immediately obvious and straightforward expression to his thoughts. Andresen objects, first, that the recital of Rome's military disasters contained in *Germ.* 37 was not a very suitable method of encouraging Tacitus' contemporaries to hope for a new attack on Germany; and, secondly, that Trajan did actually decide upon a pacific policy on the German frontier and Tacitus would hardly have opposed himself to this. But a stern warning to the Romans of his day of the magnitude of the task, through a reminder of past failure and of the formidable spirit of *Germanorum libertas*, is not incompatible with a conviction in Tacitus' own mind that such a task was indeed part of Rome's *fatum* or destiny. Meanwhile the proverbial disunity of the Germans (cf. *Ann.* ii. 62) is Rome's best hope of fulfilling her destiny, until she can learn from her foes and recover that *virtus* which is traditionally hers. Again, Trajan did not return from Germany till the spring of 99; and when the *Germania* was published in 98 it may well have seemed possible that the new soldier-Emperor might still adopt an offensive policy<sup>1</sup>. If Tacitus did not feel disposed to urge this policy quite openly, yet then, if ever, was the time at least to hint at it by implication. In *Germ.* 41 comes his well-known remark about the river Elbe: 'Albis . . . flumen inclutum et notum olim; nunc tantum auditur.' Here Anderson (op. cit., 193) comments: 'The name of the Elbe evokes a sigh over the failure of a great scheme, but Tacitus would not have favoured a forward policy in Germany.' But why not? The contemporary *Agriкола* teems with hints that Tacitus' hero had been frustrated in his proper task of carrying Rome's conquests to the

<sup>1</sup> For the impression made by Trajan's early military career, see Pliny, *Paneg.* 12-15.

ends of the earth, as the 'virtus exercituum et Romani nominis gloria' (*Agr.* 23) demanded that he should. Tacitus was, surely, quite definitely in favour of territorial expansion. In *Ann.* iv. 32 Tiberius is branded as a 'princeps proferendi imperii incuriosus'; and in *Ann.* i. 3, Tacitus complains that the German war of A.D. 14 was undertaken 'abolendae magis infamiae ob amissum cum Quintilio Varo exercitum quam cupidine proferendi imperii aut dignum ob praemium'. Corbulo, when recalled by Claudius from an offensive war in Germany in A.D. 47 is made to exclaim 'beatos quondam duces Romanos' (*Ann.* xi. 20). Twice in the *Annals* (ii. 61; iv. 4) Tacitus insists with satisfaction on the wide extent of the Empire in his own, i.e. Trajan's, day. And (*pace* Andresen) it is the obvious deduction from *Ann.* ii. 26 that Tacitus regarded as mere pretexts the arguments put forward by Tiberius for withdrawing Germanicus from a forward policy in Germany.

Finally, is it really probable that Tacitus, who in 98 twice hailed the

advent of the capable, warlike Trajan to the principate as inaugurating a *beatissimum saeculum* (*Agr.* 3 and 44), who, as Andresen himself admits, voices in no other passage any belief that Rome has now been pushed on to the defensive or is in danger of collapse, should be here 'expressing anxiety lest the immense fabric of the Empire may not always be able to withstand the assaults of its foes' (Anderson, *op. cit.* 163).<sup>1</sup> The imperial destiny is to go forward; but, as Tacitus suggests to his fellow-countrymen, with biting sarcasm, they will find it far from easy, and must largely depend on German disunity, unless they pull themselves together and revive their ancient *mores*, now more clearly exhibited in Germany than in Rome.

J. M. C. TOYNBEE.

Newnham College, Cambridge.

<sup>1</sup> Little support for this view can be gleaned from the phrase, quoted by Anderson, in *Ann.* xv. 50: 'finem adesse imperio', since *imperium* there could equally well mean, not the Empire, but Nero's rule.

## A FORGOTTEN FIGURE OF STYLE IN TACITUS

In *C.R.* lvii (1943), 67 Mr. Rattenbury explains a difficult sentence in Tacitus' *Histories* (i. 79. 12-15) which badly needed technical as well as stylistic comment. On the subject-matter Mr. Rattenbury had written convincingly before (*C.R.* lvi (1942), 113). He now deals with the construction of the passage in which, to use his own words, 'a double phrase in the first half of the sentence is picked up by a double phrase in the second half', and 'each member of the second double phrase is limited in reference to the corresponding member of the first double phrase'. Or, to put it in a formula, we have 1( $a+b$ ) and 2( $a+b$ ); 2 looks as if it picks up the whole of 1, but in fact 2*a* refers only to 1*a*, and 2*b* only to 1*b*. Mr. Walbank contributed two more examples from the first book of the *Histories*, 6. 1, and 62. 9. The last case is quite straightforward, and aptly illustrates the character of the figure: 'ut . . . (1) et strenuis vel ignavis (2)

spem metumve adderet (imperator).' In this sentence 2*a* *spem* refers only to 1*a* *strenuis*, 2*b* *metum* only to 1*b* *ignavis*, the effect of the construction lying in the disharmony which is introduced in the second part of the sentence. There are of course more complicated examples, like the two others mentioned in Mr. Rattenbury's article: i. 79. 13 has been explained by Mr. Rattenbury; i. 6. 1 has an additional twist in the participle *oneratum* instead of the finite verb which one would expect; this has given rise to wrong conjectures from Lipsius onwards.

Mr. Rattenbury suggests that a wider search might reveal more examples. As it happens, I had already started to look for further examples, for use in lectures on the *Histories*. My search has not led me very far, but as the question has been opened, I would give those parallels for what they are worth.

The figure seems to have been

recorded in the ancient Greek rhetorical writings as a type of zeugma or in technical phraseology as syllepsis. So 'double zeugma' or 'double syllepsis' are convenient names, the definition of syllepsis being a figure in which 'something which is rightly attributed to one of two things is also stated of the other'. To this definition Herodian<sup>1</sup> adds three examples, two of which are simple zeugmas,<sup>2</sup> the third approaches our figure: Pindar calls (a) Peirithoos and (b) Theseus (a) *Ζηνὸς υἱὸς καὶ* (b) *κλυτοπάλου Ποσειδάωνος*.<sup>3</sup>

The double zeugma had been observed by Hertzberg<sup>4</sup> and duly recorded by K. Heraeus.<sup>5</sup> As it was, however, not separated properly from other similar uses,<sup>6</sup> it is advisable to repeat the cases that are really certain.

Apart from the three passages from the first book of the *Histories*, there are:

*Hist.* ii. 41. 19 ut cuique (1a) audacia vel (b) formido, in (2a) primam (b) postremamve aciem (3a) prorumpabant aut (b) relabebantur.

ii. 92. 10 Vitellium (1a) subitis offensis aut (b) intempestivis blanditiis mutabilem, (2a) contemnebant (b) metuebantque.

iii. 25. 4 ut quos nullo rectore suos quemque (1a) impetus vel (b) pavor (2a) contraheret (b) diduceretve.

<sup>1</sup> Herod. *Περὶ σχημάτων* (Rhet. Gr. 3, p. 100 Spengel).

<sup>2</sup> Hom. *Il.* 9. 5, 19. 47.

<sup>3</sup> Pind. *Frag.* 243 Sch.

<sup>4</sup> On Prop. ii. 22. 33: 'Intricatus paullo dicendi genus a nullo animadversum iure mireris, cum duobus subiectis unum quidem praedicatum tribuatur, ita tamen ut partibus eius praedicati iterum discretis ad singula subiecta singulae per mutuum nexae quasi eminus referantur.' He then quotes *Paneg. ad Messal.* 40 and 48, and Tac. *Ann.* i. 55.

<sup>5</sup> Heraeus on Tac. *Hist.* i. 6. 2, iii. 25. 3.

<sup>6</sup> In his note on Tac. *Hist.* ii. 92. 9 Heraeus confused the double zeugma with the so-called distributive use of *aut*. But the curious character of our figure of style is not brought out by translating *aut* by 'and on the other hand' instead of 'or'. For *aut* other conjunctions like *et*, *vel*, *-que*, *-ve*, or even asyndeton can be used, and they are often mixed in the same sentence. What really matters is the double antithesis. The zeugma is easy if its second member can easily be referred to the first; it is difficult if the reference is obscured. In his wrong explanation Heraeus had been forestalled by Halm (app. crit. on *Ann.* i. 16. 6, retained in the later Teubner editions), and Nipperdey (note on *Ann.* ii. 30. 10, followed by Furneaux).

*Ann.* i. 55. 9 dissidere hostem in (1a) Arminium ac (b) Segestem, insignem utrumque (2a) perfidia in nos aut (b) fide.

ii. 46. 12 cum a (1a) Cheruscis (b) Langobardisque pro (2a) antiquo decore aut (b) recenti libertate . . . certaretur.

iii. 63. 14 propiora (1a) Sardinios (*sc. referre*) . . . neque minus (b) Milesios . . . niti; sed cultus numinum utrisque (2a) Dianam aut (b) Apollinem venerandi.

There are likely to be more examples in Tacitus than those nine, which come from the first three books of *Histories* and *Annals* only. But even now it is clear that Tacitus experimented with this figure and sometimes used it in very daring fashion as in *Hist.* i. 6 or in the *Annals*. So one might have felt satisfied with the truly Tacitean character of this rhetorical device had not Heraeus's and Hertzberg's references from Tacitus to Propertius,<sup>1</sup> and vice versa,<sup>2</sup> shown that this is really a traditional figure of speech, to be found in poetry before it appears in Tacitus' rhetorical prose.

Propertius says<sup>3</sup> 'ille vel hic (i.e. Hector or Achilles) classes poterant vel perdere muros'. It is obvious that only Hector is the destroyer of the fleet, only Achilles the destroyer of the walls of Troy. And yet Housman observed that 'the verse appears to contemplate either hero performing either feat, and this is absurd'; so he approved of Baehrens's conjecture, *illi vel for ille vel hic*, which removed the apparent anomaly from the text.<sup>4</sup> Hertzberg's explanation, however, explained what seems a logical absurdity as a rhetorical device, and Baehrens's conjecture is not even mentioned in Butler and Barber's *apparatus criticus*.

Similarly, as Hertzberg again pointed out, *Paneg. Messallae* (Tib. iv. 1) 40 has 'nec tamen hic aut hic tibi laus maiorve minorve', and particularly ib. 48

nec Pylos aut Ithace tantos genuisse feruntur  
Nestora vel parvae magnum decus urbis Ulixem.

<sup>1</sup> Heraeus on Tac. *Hist.* iii. 25. 3, referring to Hertzberg's note on Prop. ii. 22. 33.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. n. 4, above.

<sup>3</sup> Prop. ii. 22. 33.

<sup>4</sup> Housman, *Journ. of Philol.* xxi (1892/3) 125; Baehrens's conjecture is oddly defended by Enk ad loc.

Nestor belongs only to Pylos as Odysseus only to Ithaca.

Such an arresting figure of speech, which occurs in Tacitus as well as in Augustan poetry, is likely to be in Virgil also. I can quote at least two passages which I regard as certain cases:<sup>1</sup>

*Aen.* iii. 679-81

quales cum vertice celso  
aeriae quercus aut coniferae cyparissi  
constiterunt, silva alta Iovis lucusve Dianae.

The oak is sacred to Iupiter as the

<sup>1</sup> *Aen.* viii. 205 f. might belong here as well, if in 'ne quid inausum aut intractatum scelerisve dolive fuisset' the word *inausum* goes only with *sceleris*, and *intractatum* with *doli*; but that is uncertain. x. 707-10 is a simple, not a double, syllepsis. In other cases *-que*, or a similar particle, is distributive, and no double antithesis is employed, e.g. vi. 616, and above, p. 44, n. 6.

cypress to Diana. The second example is more complicated:

*Aen.* xii. 749-53

inclusum veluti si quando flumine nactus  
cervum aut puniceae saeptum formidine pinnae  
venator cursu canis et latratibus instat,  
ille autem insidiis et ripa territus alta  
mille fugit refugitque vias.

Here the *insidiae* only refers to *puniceae pinnae*, the feather-hung toils, while *ripa* of course echoes *flumine*.

The figure might well be older in Latin literature than Virgil. Is there anything similar to be found in Latin historiography, the other traditional source of Tacitus' style? And does the figure which looks so deliberate and rhetorical go back to Greek literature or rhetoric?

K. O. BRINK.

Oxford.

## TWO NOTES ON JUVENAL

(1) iii. 186-9

ille metit barbam, crinem hic deponit amati;  
plena domus libis venalibus. 'accipe et istud  
fermentum tibi habe.' praestare tributa clientes  
cogimur et cultis augere peculia servis.

THE chief crux in this passage is the meaning of *fermentum*. It is generally taken to mean a cake, a cause of anger, or both of these at once, as a pun. It would be a better pun if there were any indication that *fermentum* was ever used in either sense. Neither meaning, to be sure, is impossible, but both are unexampled. Many of the numerous interpretations offered for this passage<sup>1</sup> are incompatible with the context. The point Umbricius is making from v. 126 on is summed up in vv. 183-4: *omnia Romae cum pretio*. The right to say 'good morning' to the great, to receive a nod from them, to attend their domestic festivals, must be purchased with a tip. Evidently then the guest here gets the cake, and pays money, though not as a regular commercial transaction. Who gets the money? In the circumstances surely the slave in

whose honour the festival is being held. It is like a birthday party to which every guest is expected to bring a present. It is in this sense that the cakes are *venalia*. The position of *venalibus* at the end of the sentence, and after the penthemimeral caesura, fits in with this ironic emphasis.

Obviously it will not do to shove the gift glumly at the hero of the day, as Duff calls him; it must be accompanied by some gracious form of words. The poor client would certainly not dare to say to the pampered slave anything so insulting as 'take your money and keep your cake'. He must smile and say politely something like 'Take this; it's for yourself, and may it be a leaven of your fortunes'. *Istud* and *tibi habe* simply emphasize the idea, 'this is your very own, for your *peculium*'. The sense of *fermentum* is the same as in Petronius 76. 7: 'hoc fuit peculii mei fermentum'. For the sudden shift to direct speech in dramatic illustration of a situation, followed by explicit formulation of what is implied, we may compare iii. 140-4; v. 132-7; v. 166-9. If there is a double meaning in the passage at all, it might be found in *cultis*: the dapper slaves to whom we truckle.

<sup>1</sup> E.g. in the editions of Duff, Escott, Hardy, Lewis, Macleane, Mayor, Pearson and Strong, Ramsay, Wright.

(2) vii. 16

altera quos nudo traducit gallica talo  
gallica PSGU : gallia φ

The manuscript tradition and the context definitely favour the reading *gallica*. Juvenal does not say these men were barefooted; he says they were bare-ankled. If he had meant simply 'barefoot', it would have been more natural, and quite as easy, to write *pedibus . . . nudis*. Also, *traducere* in Juvenal regularly means 'expose to shame' (ii. 159; viii. 17; ix. 31). But why should the low shoe and the naked ankle expose these knights to shame? There is no indication that in Juvenal's time the *gallica* was either unusual or unfashionable. It was already fashionable, if a somewhat advanced fashion, in Antony's time, or Antony would not have worn it (Cic. *Phil.* ii. 76), and by the time of Diocletian's price-fixing edict it was apparently widely popular.

Is not the point of the gibe that these men had risen to fortune so rapidly that above the low *gallica* one naked ankle still betrayed their servile origin? It still showed the mark of the fetter that

had borne the weight of the chain on which they were herded to Rome. The line is a picturesque exaggeration of the idea that appears in the *nuper* of i. 111: 'nuper in hanc urbem pedibus qui venerat albis'. (Were the feet of slaves imported for sale perhaps originally chalked to cover the disfiguring fetter marks?)

The same point seems to occur in Martial, ii. 29. 7-8: 'non hesternā sedet lunata lingua planta, coccina non laesum pingit aluta pedem.' It is possible that Martial means only that the man can afford to buy shoes that fit him; but that seems an incongruously petty detail in so much magnificence. It is more in Martial's manner to refute a comparatively mild accusation, only to bring in a more damaging charge. The dandy he describes is not a mere parvenu, a recent importation rapidly enfranchised and enriched; not at all: he is an ex-convict.

L. A. MACKAY.

University of British Columbia.

### THE DATE AND SIGNIFICANCE OF THE 'CANDELABRUM' COINS OF AUGUSTUS.

THE rare *aurei* and *denarii* here described have long been the subject of speculation and comment:

*Obv.* ↗ CAESAR (or CAESAR) below bare youthful head to r.: the whole within an oak-wreath.

*Rev.* AVG VST to l. and r. in field. Tripod-based *candelabrum*, its shaft ornamented with rams' heads l. and r. and its top surmounted by a *patera*,<sup>1</sup> set against a wreath of

flowers, with which are incorporated two *bucrania* and two *paterae*. *N* and *R*. *BMC Rom. Emp.* i, p. 110, nos. 683ff.: pl. 17, nos. 14-15 thereto.

The youthful character of the obverse portrait has sometimes prompted the view (held, for example, by Cohen and Grueber)<sup>1</sup> that these coins were issued in the name of the young prince Gaius Caesar, elder of Augustus' two adopted sons. The fine latinity of Eckhel allowed no such conclusion, however;<sup>2</sup> and the vital objection raised by Mr.

<sup>1</sup> And not (as stated in *BMC Rom. Emp.* i, p. 110) by a crescent. The two British Museum specimens illustrated in *BMC Rom. Emp.*, pl. 17, nos. 14-15, both have their reverses badly centred and partly off the flan. But specimens elsewhere show conclusively that the object surmounting the *candelabrum* is a *patera* (e.g. in the Ashmolean Museum: cf. also the Montagu sale catalogue (Rollin and Feuadent, Paris, 1896), no. 110; the J(ohn) E(vans) sale catalogue (Rollin and Feuadent, Paris, 1909), no. 22 = Collection R. Jameson ii (Monnaies impériales romaines) (Paris, Feuadent, 1913), no. 29; Hirsch's sale catalogues xxxi

(Munich, 1912), no. 1056 and xxxiv (Munich, 1914), no. 916; and the Trau sale catalogue (Gilhofer and Ranschburg, Vienna, 1935), no. 283.

<sup>1</sup> H. Cohen, *Description historique des monnaies frappées sous l'empire romain*, i<sup>2</sup> (Paris, 1880), p. 181, following the opinion of Prosper Dupré; H. A. Grueber, *BMC Rom. Rep.* ii, p. 36, n. 1 (*ad fin.*, p. 38), and p. 42.

<sup>2</sup> J. Eckhel, *Doctrina numorum veterum*, vi<sup>2</sup> (Vienna, 1828), p. 122.



Mattingly<sup>1</sup> against the attribution to Gaius—namely, that 'Caesar August.' cannot possibly stand for '(C.) Caesar August(i f.)'—must be emphatically repeated here. Indeed, this objection may be reinforced. Augustus' distinctive names were, in the most personal sense, 'Caesar Augustus', as the whole volume of the Augustan coinage reminds us incessantly; and although 'Caesar' and 'Augustus' were constituent elements in the official nomenclature of most subsequent *principes*, no other *princeps* was to style himself 'Caesar Augustus' simply, i.e. without the explanatory addition of his own *nomen*. The official style of the young heir-presumptive was 'Gaius Caesar Augusti filius', as the coinage itself shows:<sup>2</sup> to call him 'Caesar', whether by ellipse or otherwise, would have been more than a misnomer—it would have been a confusion more absurd than any which can be predicated of an age schooled in etiquette and decorum. Finally, it need scarcely be emphasized that 'August.' cannot possibly stand for 'Augusti filius': had such an ellipse been intelligible, Augustus might have styled himself 'Imp. Caesar Div(i filius)'. It must therefore be concluded—and there should never have been any doubt—that these coins were struck in the name of Augustus himself.

I suggest that they were issued in or soon after 17 B.C., and that they refer to Augustus' celebration of the *ludi saeculares* in that year. The principal argument in support of this theory is drawn from the *candelabrum* type of the reverse. It is significant that, when Domitian struck *aurei*, *denarii*, and *aes* to commemorate his own *ludi saeculares* of A.D. 88,<sup>3</sup> one of his pictorial types was of a composite nature; it

included an inscribed *cippus* and the figure of the traditional *ludio*—both of these had been represented in the 'Secular' types of Augustus<sup>4</sup>—and also showed a *candelabrum* as a prominent feature<sup>2</sup>. Domitian's coinage, like that of his father before him, frequently copied Augustan models. This was deliberate policy, for it was intended to suggest continuity between the régime of the Blessed Augustus and that of the *parvenu* Flavian dynasty; and this policy is very well illustrated in the Domitianic 'secular' type with which we are dealing. We cannot call the type an effective one: compared with the 'sacrifice', 'suffimenta', and 'fruges' types of Domitian, it is seen to suffer from its artificial and composite nature. A *cippus* by itself, or a *ludio*, made excellent types—for Domitian as for Augustus.<sup>3</sup> But on this composite type the *ludio* approaches a *cippus*, and in doing so will pass a *candelabrum*; and it is with the *candelabrum* that we are concerned.

The Domitianic *candelabrum* is necessarily less well represented than its counterpart upon the Augustan issues: its scale is smaller, and it is merely sketched in outline, with only a suggestion of ornament. We can, however, see the tripod-base common to most *candelabra*,<sup>4</sup> and from the shaft spring simple brackets which may well be a

<sup>1</sup> *BMC Rom. Emp.* i, pl. 2, nos. 19–20 (*ludio*); pl. 3, no. 12 (*cippus*). J. Gagé, *Recherches sur les jeux séculaires* (Collection d'études latines: Paris, 1934), p. 66 f., has given good reason for identifying the curious figure of *BMC Rom. Emp.* i, pl. 2, nos. 19–20, as the *ludio* of the games: cf. *Notizie degli Scavi*, vii (1931), pp. 313–45, for the *Acta* defining the participants and ceremonial of Septimius Severus' secular games of A.D. 204. See also Gagé, *op. cit.*, p. 9, n. 1, for the suggestion of Mommsen (*Gesamm. Schr.* viii, p. 569) that the *cippus* of *BMC Rom. Emp.* i, pl. 3, no. 12, is in fact the *columna marmorea* which, with a *columna aenea*, was set up with an inscribed record of the secular games of Augustus: cf. the Augustan *acta*, *Ephemeris Epigraphica*, viii (1899), p. 229, lines 61 f.

<sup>2</sup> *BMC Rom. Emp.* ii, p. 327, no. 135 (pl. 64, no. 3); p. 395, no. 429 (pl. 78, no. 10).

<sup>3</sup> *BMC Rom. Emp.* ii, p. 326, nos. 130 ff. (pl. 63, no. 18; 64, nos. 1–2); p. 328, no. 138 (pl. 64, no. 4).

<sup>4</sup> See Daremberg-Saglio, *Dict. des antiq.*, s.v. 'candelabrum'.

<sup>1</sup> *BMC Rom. Emp.* i, p. cxxvi.

<sup>2</sup> *Id.* i, p. 85, nos. 498 ff.; p. 88, nos. 513 ff.

<sup>3</sup> These were held 105 years after the Augustan celebration, and thus anticipated the full *annus magnus* (110 years: cf. Horace, *Carm. saec.* 21–2) by five years. The 110-year interval is explained by the proclamation of the *praeco*, who called the populace to games 'quos nec spectasset quisquam nec spectaturus esset' (Suet. *Div. Claud.* 21: cf. the Augustan *acta*, *Ephemeris Epigraphica*, viii (1899), p. 229, line 56).

stylized version of the original rams' heads. Domitian's composite type incorporates three elements pointing, it would seem, with equal propriety to the *ludi saeculares*: (1) *cippus*, (2) *ludio*, (3) *candelabrum*: of these, (1) and (2) appear also as individual types for Domitian. But (1) and (2) also appear as individual types for Augustus: and it is thus difficult to resist the conclusion that (3), when found as an individual type for Augustus, symbolizes, like (1) and (2), the *ludi saeculares* of 17 B.C.

The particular significance of the *candelabrum* in this connexion is clear. *Candelabra* existed primarily to give light—whether at a dinner-party, at a ritual sacrifice, or in a *chappelle ardente*:<sup>1</sup> and the main feature in the ceremonial of Augustus' (and subsequent) secular games was that they continued for three days and three nights.<sup>2</sup> By day devotion was made to Jupiter and Juno, and in no less degree (perhaps due to Augustus' insistence) to Apollo and Diana. The three nights, however, concealed more primitive and deep-rooted ceremonies, in which sacrifice was made to Ilithyia, to the Parcae, and to Terra Mater.<sup>3</sup> Three days of religious devotion would not have been altogether remarkable: but the accompanying three nights enshrined all that was most solemn and most compelling in the religious instincts of the participants. It was the night-ritual that made the secular games what they were: it was the night-ritual for which the *candelabrum* stood, both under Augustus and under Domitian.

But Augustus' 'candelabrum' coins allude to more than the mere idea of night-ritual. A conspicuous feature of the reverse-type consists of the three

*paterae*—two of them entwined in the floral wreath, and the third surmounting the *candelabrum*.<sup>1</sup> These are the simplest symbols of sacrifice; and in the sacrifices of the *ludi saeculares* the *princeps* took a central part,<sup>2</sup> to which two coins of Augustus clearly call attention. One shows him on horseback, with *patera* in hand—perhaps representing the *pompa circensis*:<sup>3</sup> the other—a rare Spanish *aureus*—shows him sacrificing at an altar (inscribed LVDI SAECVL) at which stands also the traditional *ludio*.<sup>4</sup> And Horace himself refers in the *Carmen Saeculare*<sup>5</sup> to the white bulls sacrificed by Augustus—a sacrifice made to Jupiter and Juno.<sup>6</sup> It is to this aspect of the Secular Games that the *bucrania*, twined in the wreath about the *candelabrum*, must refer.<sup>7</sup>

The whole symbolism of the 'candelabrum' reverse-type is therefore highly appropriate to the Secular Games: the *candelabrum* itself specially recalls the three nights of solemn ritual to the darker deities; the *paterae* remind us of the sacrifices, and the *bucrania* of the victims, offered to the two great Capitoline powers; and it is even possible that the wreath of flowers alludes to the third-night ceremonies in honour of Terra Mater.<sup>8</sup> The obverse-

<sup>1</sup> It is just possible that the object on top of the *candelabrum* is the actual oil-vessel (rendered in 'unforeshortened perspective') in which the flame burned, rather than a *patera*. But its form is identical with that of the *paterae* in the wreath. In any case the question is not one of great importance.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Gagé, op. cit., p. 48 f., and also the liturgy of the *acta Severiana* in *Notizie degli Scavi*, loc. cit.

<sup>3</sup> *BMC Rom. Emp.* i, pl. 3, no. 3: cf. Gagé, op. cit., p. 59 f.

<sup>4</sup> *BMC Rom. Emp.* i, pl. 10, no. 4: possibly also a *denarius*, cf. *BMC Rom. Rep.* ii, p. 41.

<sup>5</sup> Line 49, 'quaque vos bobus veneratur albis.'

<sup>6</sup> See the Augustan *acta*, *Ephemeris Epigraphica*, viii (1899), p. 231, lines 103-4, 118-20.

<sup>7</sup> It may be suggested that the wreath (of flowers) may allude to the important part played by Terra Mater in the ceremonies: it was to her that the third and final night was dedicated: see *Ephemeris Epigraphica*, viii (1899), p. 232, lines 134 ff. But cf. Horace, *Carm. saec.* 30.

<sup>8</sup> We may note the absence of any obvious reference to Apollo and Diana, to whom (as is generally agreed) much greater prominence was given by Augustus than had been usual before

<sup>1</sup> Cf. G. McN. Rushforth in *Journal of Roman Studies*, v (1915), pp. 151 ff.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Horace, *Carm. saec.* 23-4: also the Augustan *acta*, *Ephemeris Epigraphica*, viii (1899), p. 228, lines 39 ff.

<sup>3</sup> See Gagé, op. cit., pp. 25 ff.; F. Altheim, *A History of Roman Religion* (London, 1938), pp. 394 ff.; and, in general, M. P. Nilsson in Pauly-Wissowa, *Realenzyklopädie*, s.v. 'saeculares (ludi)', esp. cols. 1707 ff., and F. Blumenthal, 'Ludi saeculares', *Klio*, xv (1918), pp. 217 ff.

typ  
por  
—i  
Au  
it i  
Iul  
ide  
coi  
sid  
call  
tain  
men

(cf. C  
Carm  
May  
was  
type  
the S  
cario  
ideali  
Apoll  
CAES  
sible.

<sup>1</sup> A  
no. 1  
sentin

<sup>2</sup> C

AMM  
infor  
broth  
Gree  
impe  
that  
The  
Julia  
xvi.  
rend  
firme  
discip  
docti  
nequ  
venir  
his na  
it ha  
fathe

type is less easy to interpret. The portrait—a youthful, idealized portrait—is hardly recognizable as that of Augustus, now 46 years of age. Possibly it is a studiously indefinite allusion to Iulus, 'founder' of the Julian gens: an idealized head appeared on the Roman coinage of 17 B.C., adorned with the *sidus Iulium*,<sup>1</sup> and this too may have called attention to Iulus. Horace certainly did so, though without specific mention:

Roma si vestrum est opus, Iliaequē  
litus Etruscum tenere turmae,  
iussa pars mutare Lares et urbem  
sospite cursu,  
cui per ardentem sine fraude Troiam  
castus Aeneas patriae superstes  
liberum munivit iter, daturus  
plura relictis:  
di, probos mores docili iuventae,  
di, senectuti placidae quietem,  
Romulae genti date remque prolemque  
et decus omne.<sup>2</sup>

(cf. Gagé, *op. cit.*, pp. 25 ff.), and to whom Horace's *Carmen Saeculare* is in the first place addressed. May we suppose that this Augustan innovation was disregarded by the engraver of our reverse-type in favour of the more traditional elements of the Secular Games? An alternative—and a precarious one—would be to suppose that the idealized portrait of the obverse-type represents Apollo. But the association of the obverse-legend CAESAR would seem to render such a view impossible.

<sup>1</sup> *BMC Rom. Emp.* i, pl. 2, nos. 19–20; pl. 3, no. 1: now regarded by Mr. Mattingly as representing not the Dictator but rather Iulus.

<sup>2</sup> *Carm. saec.* 37–48.

## THE EMPEROR JULIAN'S KNOWLEDGE OF LATIN

AMMIANUS MARCELLINUS, xiv. 1. 9, informs us that Gallus, Julian's half-brother, had a very good knowledge of Greek, 'Graeco sermone, cuius erat impendio gnarus', the implication being that his native language was Latin. The same writer elsewhere tells us that Julian was able to speak some Latin, xvi. 5. 7 'aderat Latine quoque disserendi sufficiens sermo', and this is confirmed by Eutropius, x. 16. 3 'liberalibus disciplinis adprime eruditus, Graecia doctior atque adeo ut Latina eruditio nequaquam cum Graeca scientia conveniret'. The implication here is that his native tongue was Greek. How does it happen that the sons of the same father have different mother-tongues?

The great year 17 B.C. saw the consummation of centuries of Roman endeavour: the seed of Aeneas had grown to maturity in the dazzling figure of Caesar Augustus,

divi genus, aurea condet  
saecula qui rursus Latio regnata per arva  
Saturno.<sup>1</sup>

The 'candelabrum' coins may thus be dated in or just after 17 B.C.,<sup>2</sup> of which year they commemorate the great events. Concerning the mint at which they were struck I offer no suggestion. Mr. Mattingly has noted their decorative character, somewhat redolent of the East, but admits that 'we have no definite clue to guide us'.<sup>3</sup> The question of mintage may not easily be solved: but at least it should be noted that the issue, wherever struck and however limited, was important enough to call for the use of gold as well as silver.

C. H. V. SUTHERLAND.

*Ashmolean Museum, Oxford.*

<sup>1</sup> Virgil, *Aeneid*, vi. 792 ff.

<sup>2</sup> A few 'secular' types appeared at Rome in 16 B.C.: cf. *BMC Rom. Emp.* i, pl. 3, nos. 8 and 12.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, p. cxxvi. He has since suggested to me that, if Augustus coined a special issue for 17 B.C., such an issue might show a style otherwise unfamiliar to us.

Julius Constantius, their father, spoke Latin—we are explicitly told that his brother Constantine the Great was unable to speak Greek adequately;<sup>1</sup> but in the course of his scholarly life at Toulouse and his subsequent residence at Corinth Julius Constantius certainly learnt to converse easily in Greek.

His first wife Galla, who bore him Gallus on his estate in Etruria, was, like her brothers,<sup>2</sup> a native of Rome. She died a couple of years after Gallus was born in A.D. 325/6, but we may be sure that the first language her son ever

<sup>1</sup> Eusebius, *Vit. Const.* iii. 13.

<sup>2</sup> Dessau, 1237, with Seck, P.-W. iii, 1981, and *Zw. R.* i. 1187.

heard was Latin. Since it is unlikely that Julius Constantius after her death addressed his son in a foreign language, we may take it as certain that Gallus spoke little but Latin until his father's murder in A.D. 337, but in the course of his elementary education at Constantinople he would have learnt the rudiments of Greek. In the obscure period of his life immediately after 337 in Asia Minor and during his six years at Macellum (ending early in 348) there were many occasions on which it was impossible for him to use his native tongue, and to this time we must ascribe the comparative perfection of his Greek which Ammianus assures us had been achieved by A.D. 353.

Julian's mother, Basilina, the second wife of Julius Constantius, was a native Greek speaker. Her father was probably a native of Phoenicia,<sup>1</sup> and her tutor, the Scythian eunuch Mardonius, had been educated with the special purpose of instructing her in the poems of Hesiod and Homer,<sup>2</sup> and he certainly knew no Latin. Greek then will have been the language of Julian's first five years, but he will frequently have heard his father speaking Latin. Again, at Macellum, where all his instructors were Greek-speaking, he doubtless often addressed Gallus in Latin, although Gallus had now so far progressed with his Greek that, despite his being far from studious by nature, he was delighted to hear his Greek oratory praised.<sup>3</sup>

But in his education at Constantinople, Nicomedia, Ephesus, and Athens Julian would have heard practically nothing but Greek, for Constantius did not want him to be educated in the language of the army and the administration.<sup>4</sup> Yet Latin speakers were among the philosophers and rhetors who flocked to hear him at Ephesus, so

that he would not have heard Greek exclusively.<sup>1</sup> This is not to say, however, as Koch does,<sup>2</sup> that Julian was already well enough educated in Latin at Constantinople: Koch presses this passage of Libanius unduly.

When Julian went to Gaul in December A.D. 355 all was changed, for Latin alone was spoken in the army and the administration. But Julian had not altogether forgotten the tongue of his father and his half-brother, and a few months after his arrival we hear of him frequently quoting the proverb: 'clitellae bovi sunt impositae; plane non est nostrum onus',<sup>3</sup> a saying which he would scarcely have known if his study of Latin had only begun in the last days of December in the preceding year. In all, it is clear that Bidez<sup>4</sup> exaggerates somewhat in saying that Julian did not begin to learn Latin until he went to Gaul. He had had a smattering of it all his life, but it was certainly in Gaul that he attained that level of proficiency which Ammianus attributes to him. Before long, in fact, he was able to deliver speeches to the army in Latin which invariably had a profoundly moving effect on the troops. Seeck observes<sup>5</sup> that Ammianus' cool description of Julian's Latin, *Latine disserendi sufficiens sermo*, in a passage which is otherwise highly panegyric, clearly indicates that Julian spoke extremely bad Latin. But in view of the effectiveness of his addresses to the army it is perhaps better to conclude that, while Julian's Latin was far from good, Ammianus, who was himself at the time learning Latin with very considerable success, was not very charitable to his struggling fellow-student.

The Latin spoken in the frontier districts of Gaul does not seem to have been of a particularly good quality—at any rate, it was held in considerable contempt by the inhabitants of Aqu-

<sup>1</sup> Seeck, P.-W. x. 93, s.v. 'Julianos' (32). His identity was established by Bidez, *Mélanges Paul Thomas*, pp. 57 ff.; cf. his edition of Julian, *Lettres*, p. 71. 13, with critical note. So Julian may have had Semitic blood in his veins.

<sup>2</sup> Julian, *Misop.* 352 ab.

<sup>3</sup> Libanius, *Or.* i. 97; cf. Greg. Naz., *Or.* iv. 30.

<sup>4</sup> Bidez, *Vie de l'Empereur Julien*, pp. 52 f.; cf. Eunap. *Vit. Soph.*, p. 428 (Wright, Loeb ed.).

<sup>1</sup> Libanius, *Or.* xviii. 21.

<sup>2</sup> *Revue Belge de Philologie et d'Histoire*, 1927, p. 125, n. 4.

<sup>3</sup> Ammianus, xvi. 5. 10; cf. Cic., *ad Att.* v. 15. 3; Quintilian, v. 11. 21.

<sup>4</sup> *Vie*, p. 52 f.

<sup>5</sup> *Untergang*, iv. 458 f.



tania.<sup>1</sup> Partly perhaps for this reason but chiefly because of his profound attachment to Greek and Greek literature, Julian's letters written from Gaul to his friends in the East repeatedly complain of his having to speak Latin—he is, he says, becoming 'barbarized'.<sup>2</sup> Although he was reading and writing Greek in immense quantities—he was called a *litterio Graecus* at Constantius' court in the winter of 357/8—he only studied those Latin documents which it was politically expedient for him to read, viz. the published Latin speeches of Constantius.<sup>4</sup>

Bearing in mind Julian's statement that he was becoming barbarized, i.e. that he was compelled to speak Latin continuously in Gaul, can we trace any Latin influence on his own Greek writings of this period? I have been able to find only one instance of a latinism in his Greek. In the *Epistle to the Athenians*, written when he had just left Gaul but was still in the Latin West at Nish, he uses the phrase *οὐκ οἶδα οὐτινός μοι στρατιώτων δόντος μανιάκην*, where surely *οὐκ οἶδα οὐτινός* is an

unconscious recollection of the Latin use of *nescio quis*.<sup>1</sup>

After he became Emperor the discussions in the imperial consistorium were carried on in Greek when he was present, although it was a breach of custom for the Emperor to give his decisions in the consistorium in Greek.<sup>2</sup> Although several of his laws are written in his own very individual style, there can be little doubt that he wrote them out in Greek and gave them to the Imperial secretaries to render into Latin.<sup>3</sup> There is no reason to think that he ever read any literary work composed by a Roman, apart from Constantius' speeches, and the references in his own writings to events of Roman history are doubtless derived without exception from Greek historians, especially Plutarch.

E. A. THOMPSON.

University College, Swansea.

<sup>1</sup> *Ep. ad Ath.* 284 d. Is his use of *τριακοσιστός* (wrongly changed to *τριακοστός* by Hertlein and Wright) in the same pamphlet, 276 a, an echo of the Latin use of *trecenti* to denote an indefinitely large number?

<sup>2</sup> Gothofredus on *Cod. Theod.* xi. 39. 5; and see his note on vi. 24. 1 for the use of Greek in Julian's laws. Greek occasionally appears in laws issued before his time, e.g. viii. 15. 1.

<sup>3</sup> Bidez, *Lettres*, preface, p. iii; Borries, P.-W. x. 83. On the few Latin words—all technical terms—in his letters, see Wright, Loeb ed., vol. iii. 69, n. 3.

<sup>1</sup> Sulpicius Severus, *Dial.* i. 27.

<sup>2</sup> *Epp.* 8 and 9; cf. 13, ed. Bidez.

<sup>3</sup> Ammianus, xvii. 11. 1.

<sup>4</sup> *Or.* ii. 77 d. We do not hear that Constantius knew much Greek.

## TWO NOTES ON THE *PHILOCTETES*

- (1) *NE. τί δὴτα δρᾶσω; ΦΙ. μή με ταρβήσας προδῶς ἦκει γὰρ αὐτὴ διὰ χρόνου πλάνοις ἴσως ὥς ἐξεπλήσθη. NE. ἰὼ δὴ δύστηνε σὺ, δύστηνε δὴτα διὰ πόνων πάντων φανεῖς.* (757 ff.)

Pearson accepted 759, but there is no Sophoclean parallel for the treatment of *ἰὼ* as *yo*, and the use of *αὐτὴ* for *νόσος* is strange. F. W. Schmidt's *λῆγει γὰρ αὐτὴ διὰ χρόνου πλάνοις νόσος ὥς ἐξεπλήσθη* has two good points, the alteration of *αὐτὴ* to *αὐτῇ* and the introduction of *νόσος*, but the changes of *ἦκει* and *ἴσως* are not plausible and the metrical oddity remains.

I suggest that no change is needed except Schmidt's *αὐτῇ*, Arndt's omission of the first *ἰὼ*, and the insertion of *νόσος* after *ἐξεπλήσθη*.

The lines would then run

*ἦκει γὰρ αὐτῇ διὰ χρόνου πλάνοις ἴσως ὥς ἐξεπλήσθη νόσος. NE. ἰὼ δύστηνε σὺ, . . .*

The loss of *νόσος* before *νε* or *νεο* (which are L's usual abbreviations, though not written in minuscules like the text) would be very easy. Sophocles must have had in mind Hesiod, *W.D.* 102 ff. *νοῦσος δ' ἀνθρώποισιν ἐφ' ἡμέρη, αἱ δ' ἐπὶ νυκτὶ | αὐτόματοι φοιτοῦσι*.

Mr. E. Harrison has referred me to the three Sophoclean examples of unelided words shaped like *νόσος* (*χρόνου, κράτος, κλέος*) so placed in trimeters (other than melic trimeters), one (*Ajax*, 343) being followed by a comma; and also to one Sophoclean instance (l. 539 of this play) of a change of speakers at the same point, and a combination of the two features seems unobjectionable.

- (2) *μή δὴτα, τέκνον· ἀλλ' ἄ μοι ξυνήμουσας πέμψον πρὸς οἶκους.* (1367 f.)

Here Pearson reads *ἀλλὰ μ' ὁ ξυνήνεσας* (Blaydes, taking *ξυνήνεσας* from Herwerden). The change of verb is perhaps desirable, though scarcely necessary, but no other letter need be altered: read

*ἀλλὰ μ' οἱ ξυνήνεσας*

*πέμψον πρὸς οἶκους.*

Blaydes referred to 1398 f., *ἂ δ' ἦνεσάς μοι δεξιᾶς ἐμῆς θιγόν, | πέμπειν πρὸς οἶκους, ταῦτά μοι πρᾶξον, τέκνον*, but this gives no presumption in favour of *δ* against *οἱ*.

Compare *Ant.* 891 ff. *ὦ κατασκαφῆς | οἰκῆσις ἀεὶφρουρος, οἱ πορεύομαι | πρὸς τοὺς ἐμμανῆς*.

D. S. ROBERTSON.

Trinity College, Cambridge.



EURIPIDES, *PHOENISSAE* 504

ἐγὼ γὰρ οὐδέν, μήτερ, ἀποκρύψας ἐρῶ  
 ἄστρον ἂν ἔλθοιμι' ἥλιον πρὸς ἀντολὰς  
 καὶ γῆς ἐνερθεῖν, δυνατὸς ὢν δρᾶσαι τάδε,  
 τὴν θεῶν μεγίστην ὥστ' ἔχειν Τυραννίδα.

EURIPIDES never did better for his actors than this outburst of Eteocles; but what grammar or sense is *ἄστρον*? Useless to cite, e.g. Plato, *Polit.* 269 a δούσεως τε καὶ ἀνατολῆς ἡλίου καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἄστρον; for where is our καὶ or τε? True, some such phrase turning in the scribe's mind may have bred the corruption. Read ἄσσω and compare Aesch. *Ag.* 1180-1 λαμπρὸς δ' εἰκεν ἥλιον πρὸς ἀντολὰς πνέων δαΐζειν where Bothe corrected the ἐσ ἤζειν of the MSS. Also Evadne's leap at Eur. *Supp.* 1065, ἄσσω θανόντος Καπανέως τήνδ' ἐς πυρὰν, and Ar. *Eq.* 485, θέουσι γὰρ ἄξας ἐς τὸ βουλευτήριον. Euripides teems with Aeschylean echoes; he must have had the *Agamemnon* almost by heart, and likes words of rapid, nervous motion such as ἄσσω and πίνυλος. He had tried this particular effect some years before, in the mouth of Polymestor blinded and raving: *Hec.* 1099-1105 ποὶ τράπῳμαι, ποὶ πορευθῶ; ἀμπατάμενος οὐράνιον ὑψιπέτῃς ἐς μέλαθρον, Ὀδάρῳν ἢ Σείριος ἐνθα πυρὸς φλογέας ἀφίγησιν ὅσων αὐγὰς, ἢ τὸν ἐς Ἀἶδα μελέγχρωτα πορβὸν ἄξω τάλας; so *Bacch.* 306-8 is foreshadowed by *Ion* 714-18, *I.T.* 1243-4, and the first three lines of the *Hypsipyle*.

E. L. B. MEURIG-DAVIES.

Oxford.

## AN UNRECORDED TRAGIC LINE?

THE scholiast at *Odyssey* 1.93 in the Venetian MS. 613 (Dindorf's M, Allen's U<sup>1</sup>, which Dindorf describes as *omnium . . . integerrimus in scholiis ad libros Odysseae quattuor primos*) discusses the reasons for Telemachus' journey to Sparta. He ends: *ἐτι μάλα καὶ τῆς ἐπιβουλῆς τῶν μνηστήρων ὁ κίνδυνος ἠκόνθησεν αὐτοῦ τὴν προθυμίαν*. 'Whetted his eagerness' is too good a phrase for even a good scholiast. Delete the scholiast's obvious adaptation of his quotation, and an iambic trimeter of some merit emerges:

κίνδυνος ἠκόνθησεν τὴν προθυμίαν,

which has not, as far as I can find, been noticed before.

As to its origin, one can only guess that it came from some play about a young romantic hero like Telemachus (who has no tragedy in his name), such as Jason, or Meleager, or else from a play in which Telemachus himself was a character. Its diction and sentiment seem to me to be Euripidean.

W. B. STANFORD.

Trinity College, Dublin.

## ΤΡΑΧΗΛΟΣ, 'HEAD'?

IN C.R. liii. 58 Prof. J. Enoch Powell quotes passages where *τράχηλος* means 'head and neck', and later passages where 'it may almost be said that *τράχηλος* and *κεφαλὴ* are synonymous'. In sharp contrast to these stands Ditt. *Syll.*<sup>3</sup> 1169 (Epidauros) *ἐδόκει τὰς θυγατράς οὐ τὸν θεὸν ἀποτάμνοντα τὰν κεφαλὰν τὸ σῶμα κραιμάσαι κάτω τὸν τράχαλον ἔχον*. The contrast is an indication that the extension (and subsequent change?) of meaning took place only in special and suitable circumstances, either (1) when the head is necessarily implied, in the *τράχηλον ἀποτέμνειν* type, which includes most of Prof. Powell's examples, among them Schol. Thuc. vi. 27. 1 τοὺς τραχήλους . . . περικοπήναι, where Thucydides himself has *περικόπησαν τὰ πρόσωπα*, or (2) when no strict distinction can be made between the head and neck; this is indeed shown by the equation Plut. *Alex.* 45. 5 τὸν τράχηλον = *Att. An.* iv. 3. 2 τὴν τε κεφαλὴν καὶ τὸν αὐχένα. The first of these types has a perfect counterpart in Lat. *decollo*, 'decapitate'.

The extension of meaning established here is yet another example of the notorious tendency of terms for parts of the body to become vague in meaning. Other typical examples are Lat. *os*, 'mouth' and 'face', *γένυς* 'chin', 'lower jaw', pl. 'jaws'. The complete change of meaning which sometimes does in fact result is exemplified by the derivations *coxa* > *cuisse*, *bucca* > *bouche*, and by the etymological equation *γένυς* = *chin* = *gena* = Dan. *Kind* 'cheek'.

G. P. SHIPP.

University of Sydney.

## REVIEWS

## GREEK LITERATURE AND ART

T. B. L. WEBSTER: *Greek Interpretations*. Pp. viii+128; 8 plates. Manchester: University Press, 1942. Cloth, 5s. net.

THIS essay was written, the author says, for two reasons: to set down the views he had reached, by the outbreak of the war, on certain phases of Greek literature and art, and to propound a method of teaching Greek in English. The method is this: nine writers, or

groups of writers, are selected (mostly, naturally, poets), their work is illustrated by a passage translated, and a comparison is instituted with contemporary works of art which show the same spirit or a similar technique. Homer is illustrated by the Demodocus-scene in *Odyssey* viii, Solon by frag. 1, Sophocles by the speech in the *Antigone* which so many think he did not write; Isocrates and Plato share a chapter,

and Aeschylus, Pindar, and Bacchylides appear together in a chapter entitled 'the Court of Hiero'. There is a short but very fresh and interesting account of Ionia in the sixth century, its art and poetry; and the book ends with a judicious survey of Virgil's borrowings from Greek.

As an experiment in method the book is interesting. It is, of course, too short: as the author says, it is impossible to give an idea of Homer in a little space—less than twelve small pages. It is a method, too, which can more easily succeed with a writer who, like Theocritus or Pindar, can be represented by a complete poem than with one who has to be fobbed off with an extract supplemented by summaries and adjectives. But the feeling of tightness and constriction that the book too often gives comes from other sources as well.

In the first place, analogies between the arts are sometimes used in a superficial way, which gives prominence to relatively unimportant details of form or structure and omits what matters most and is most characteristic. Thus of Sophocles we are told that the ornate language, the flashing imagery, the violent distortions of Pindar and Aeschylus give place to sweeter rhythms and small-scale patterning; we are referred to the contrast between the Olympic sculptures and the Parthenon frieze. In itself this may be just enough. It is illustrated, from the *Antigone*-passage, by the use of antithesis, the repetitions of words, and the assonances between long vowels. Nothing else is said about either the style or the form of Sophocles, except that he used character-contrast, and 'builds balancing systems of scenes, odes, and speeches'—all of which gives the impression that Sophocles was a kind of eighteenth-century version of an R. L. Stevenson, formal, orderly, and self-conscious. There is no hint of the concentration, the energy, the terrific unity of every feature, big and small, of a Sophoclean play; nor does the mention of the Parthenon frieze suggest to the author that there is big-scale patterning in both the temple and the

plays, and perhaps a more far-reaching analogy to be drawn from the temple than from the frieze.

Similarly, Homer has his sense of form and design. And how is this illustrated? That in writing each epic Homer selected one definite theme, and so gave a magnificent unity to what might have been a shapeless monster; that in doing this he proves himself Greek—nothing of this kind is mentioned. It is pointed out instead that the narrative, in *Iliad* xxii, of the fight between Hector and Achilles takes the form A [B (C D) (C' D')], etc. Why is this selected to illustrate the 'cosmos' that Homer made? Because the author sees a similarity between this symmetry and the new designs, in rhythmical bands, on the contemporary pottery, which makes a similar 'cosmos'; he even suggests that the painters got the idea from the Homeric technique. That a detail of literary technique, by direct transference, produced in painters a new sense of design is surely not so likely as that both poet and painters came at much the same time under the same influences, and then worked out their own problems independently. Homer may have led the way, as the poets did in the Romantic movement; but the painters would surely notice and be stimulated by the strength of Homer's major design rather than by one minor part of it. The real point of interest, certainly the point which a book like this ought first to make, is the almost simultaneous appearance in Greek culture of that typically Greek thing, a strong, logical, but supple command of form.

A second source of constriction is the narrowly moralist path which Professor Webster drives for himself through much of Greek poetry. Solon is treated (as poet) only as one who developed ideas from Homer and Hesiod on the problems of suffering and evil. He is presented as a systematic thinker who was somewhat baffled by the fact that he was born some 150 years before the ingenious invention of prose: 'Solon cannot state clearly the workings of Zeus and Atê; he can only compare—

a blaze from a little spark. . . .—As if there were no poets even to-day who cannot state, only compare. Pindar and Aeschylus appear only as poets who preached doctrines of *ὑβρις, πάθος μάθος*, and *σωφροσύνη*; so much so that 'Pindar, like Solon, used his style to startle his audience into accepting and remembering a new truth' (even in those many odes in which the new truth is not mentioned?); and 'the new style [of Pindar and Aeschylus] was forged to preach a new doctrine, or rather a further development of the doctrine of Solon'—this itself being a further development of the doctrine of Buffon: 'Le style, c'est l'homme même: l'homme même, c'est le dogme'.

All of this would be acceptable in a

book on Greek religious thought, but it is far from giving a true picture of Pindar and Aeschylus as poets. It is not surprising therefore that Professor Webster's treatment of them (and of the other tragic poets too) is inadequate and his parallels not as fundamental as they might be.

The later chapters are freer, and, without attempting to say much that is new, give in a short space a good idea of such writers as Plato, Isocrates, Menander, and the chief Alexandrian poets. The translations supplied, one by Mr. Robert Willis, the others by Lady Barlow, are very good.

H. D. F. KITTO.

University of Glasgow.

#### ARISTOTLE'S *DE GENERATIONE*

Aristotle: *Generation of Animals*. With an English translation by A. L. PECK. (Loeb Classical Library.) Pp. lxxviii+608. London: Heinemann, 1943. Cloth, 10s. (leather 12s. 6d.) net.

DR. A. L. PECK, to whom we already owe a version of the *Parts of Animals* in the Loeb series published in 1937, has now put us under a further obligation by producing an equally valuable volume containing the *Generation of Animals*. Of this we already possessed the admirable Oxford translation by the late Professor Arthur Platt published in 1910, which showed a very acute mind at work on the text and contained a more generous allowance of notes than is generally found in that series. Dr. Peck follows Professor Platt in giving us abundant notes which greatly enhance the interest of the work, and, to judge by the authorities quoted in the textual and subject-matter notes, it would seem that the work done on the subject of the treatise since 1910 would alone amply justify the present volume. But it is also justified by the intrinsic merits of Dr. Peck's translation. His ideals of translation are well described in his own words: 'my aim has been not to paraphrase Aristotle or to "improve" him but to represent what he says as closely and as faithfully as possible in

English.' He has certainly succeeded in giving us a version which is at once close to the original and eminently readable.

The Preface deals with the plan of A.'s zoological works, of which *G.A.* is the culmination: the date of its composition (which Dr. Peck places in A.'s second period of residence at Athens); A.'s method; his contribution to embryology; his theory of form and matter in reproduction; his predecessors and successors in this field; early translations of the *G.A.* (the ninth-century Arabic version) was used by Michael Scot for his Latin translation made at Toledo in the thirteenth century, of which Dr. Peck has made considerable use); a list of manuscripts (of which Z, at C.C.C. Oxford, is the best), regarding which the conclusion is drawn that all extant manuscripts are descended from the same archetype; and, lastly, a Bibliography. Then follows an Introduction dealing with a number of Aristotelian terms, and a full summary of the contents of the *G.A.*

Dr. Peck's text shows a considerable advance on any previous one. The most recent was the Teubner text of Aubert and Wimmer (1860), which was a considerable improvement on Bekker's Berlin text of 1831. Important con-

tributions have since been made by Susemihl, Platt, Bitterauf, who about 1913 was preparing a new edition for Messrs. Teubner which has never appeared, and many others. Dr. Peck does not offer any very striking emendations of his own, for which indeed there does not seem to be much scope, but attention may be called to ἡμίονος for μόνος (747<sup>b</sup>25) and the additions of ἐν (718<sup>b</sup>11), ἦ (730<sup>a</sup>8) and ὧν (754<sup>b</sup>17), and the insertion, mostly on the basis of Scot's translation, of words or phrases omitted owing to homoeoteleuton at 722<sup>a</sup>20, 738<sup>a</sup>8, and 766<sup>b</sup>35. Examples where Scot's version is cited to confirm emendations by Platt, who made no use of Scot, are ἀνόμοιον δὲν (747<sup>b</sup>23) and ὁμόρρους (763<sup>b</sup>3). The punctuation and paragraphing show a great advance on any previous edition. Dr. Peck in bracketing a number of passages which he regards as irrelevant, sometimes perhaps underrates A.'s tendency to incorporate in the body of his works passages which in a modern book would be placed in notes or even in appendixes.

A modern reader of this treatise cannot but marvel that the first systematic expounder of the principles of Logic, Ethics, Politics, Physics, Metaphysics,

Rhetoric, and Literary Criticism also found time to set down in this and his other zoological works a vast number of accurate and detailed observations on animal life, the truth of which has in some cases only been recognized by quite modern research (for example, his hints of the 'hectocolylization' of one of the arms of the octopus and the 'peniform clitoris' of the female hyena). Even if all the recorded observations were not Aristotle's personal work, which seems almost impossible, he must have been a skilful director of research, and he was certainly the founder of the science of Zoology. Aristotle's theory of reproduction was obviously wrong, since he knew nothing of the spermatozoön, much less of gametes and genes; on the other hand, he correctly comprehended the functions of the placenta and of the umbilical cord, and no one before his time had thought of employing the comparative method in embryology. In the study of reproduction, as in so many departments of knowledge, Aristotle amply deserves the title bestowed upon him by Dante of 'the master of those who know'.

EDWARD S. FORSTER.

*University of Sheffield.*

### THE LOEB DIONYSIUS

Dionysius of Halicarnassus: *Roman Antiquities*. With an English translation by Earnest CARY, Ph.D., on the basis of the version of Edward Spelman. Vol. IV: Books VI, 49—VII. Pp. 385. (Loeb Classical Library.) London: Heinemann, 1943. Cloth, 10s. (leather, 12s. 6d.) net.

DR. CARY maintains his high standard of accuracy and literary taste in continuing his edition of Dionysius, and this review will touch mainly on points of interest and controversy.

There is one feature, however, arising from his use of Jacoby, which calls for some comment. As he stated in his introduction, Cary bases his textual notes on Jacoby's critical apparatus, without fresh collations of the MSS.,

querying anything in Jacoby that is badly recorded. Usually this does not matter very much, but sometimes it does. To take the most striking instances, vi. 87. 2, 89. 2; vii. 41. 4 are slight, but vii. 51. 5, 71. 2 are more serious. The moral (to be applied in better times and by other editors besides Cary) is to use microphotography, for which every large library has facilities, in checking MSS. readings.

Once the reader is reconciled to the fact that a close rendering of Dionysius' Greek necessarily weakens the robust English of Spelman, the translation can only be praised. To appreciate the work behind Cary's success as a whole we may look at one of the rare cases where he has not quite succeeded. vii. 34. 5: ἀλλ' ὡς ἐχθροῦ προπηλακίζοντος



ἀδεῶς τοὺς ὑπὸ χεῖρας ἀκρατός τις χολή  
καὶ βαρεία τοῦ κακῶς πάσχοντος ὑπερ-  
οψία: 'but the ungovernable fury of  
an enemy, insulting the subdued with  
impunity, and a severe contempt of  
their sufferings' (Spelman); 'but rather  
the untamed wrath of an enemy  
fearlessly insulting those under his  
power with an implacable contempt for  
his victim' (Cary). Cary weakens Spel-  
man for the sake of literal translation,  
yet suddenly exaggerates 'severe' into  
'implacable' for βαρεία. Sometimes  
archaisms survive. In vi. 52. 2 'habita-  
tions' is kept for οἰκήσεις, although in  
52. 3 ἀνέστιον becomes 'homeless' (Spel-  
man: 'who have no habitations').

The main interest is again in textual  
matters. Cary has revived many good  
corrections by the older scholars, e.g.  
vi. 69. 1 εἰς, vii. 35. 5 σχῆμα, 59. 4 λόγοι  
(cf. iv. 17. 3); he might have considered  
Jacoby more carefully at vii. 1. 6  
ὠρογραφίαις, 36. 4 αὐτοί, 42. 3 διαφορῶν.  
He has profited by suggestions from  
the General Editors, Capps and Post,  
who emend neatly, e.g. vi. 56. 4 ἔνεστιν  
οἰκεῖον καὶ κοινόν, vii. 1. 1 εὐτυχεστέροι  
(cf. Livy, ii. 41. 4; iv. 60. 7), 46. 3  
(Capps' rearrangement); also, in the  
critical notes, vi. 62. 3; vii. 55. 1. He  
has attractive corrections of his own at  
vi. 96. 1 ἀπ', vii. 46. 5 ἦ; he rightly  
follows Jacoby at vii. 17. 2 οὕτω  
πρότερον (cf. 59. 1), the balance of the  
sentence supports his προσηγορία at  
vii. 15. 1, and his suggestion at vi. 96. 4  
is valuable. Some emendations are  
recorded which might merit inclusion  
in the text, e.g. vi. 51. 3 ἀσπείστως,  
vii. 10. 1 καὶ bracketed, leaving κελεύσας  
(cf. vi. 59. 3 ἀπολυόμενος, vii. 48. 1  
ὑπολαμβάνων), 17. 1 ὀλιγωρία . . . προσ-  
εἶχον οἱ ὀλιγωρεῖν . . . προσέχειν, 44. 2  
αὐτόθεν, 72. 1 οὐσίαν.

These are matters of opinion; but in  
some places Cary is open to criticism.  
In vi. 49. 3 ὁμῶς ἦν is corrupt, as Cary  
agrees: read Jacoby's ὁμῶς; in vi. 81. 1  
Naber's ἐξετήκετο is too strong: base  
correction on ἐξεχέιτο; in vii. 34. 5  
πολίτου is satisfactory when contrasted  
with ἰδιώτου; in vii. 64. 6 αὐτῷ τιμησάντων  
or the like appears necessary; in vii.  
72. 13 Ἐλένης does appear false. An

editor reading Πόστομος at vi. 93. 2  
might well read Λανᾶτος at vi. 69. 3,  
and if he accepts the supplement οὔτε  
διοικησάμενος at vii. 67. 3, why not  
ἐνυβρίζων or the like at vii. 50. 1?

Cary and Post appear to be on the  
wrong line in vi. 85. 3 καὶ εἴ γε δι'  
ἀνάγκην τῆς πίστεως καὶ ἐλπίδος τὰ συμ-  
βόλαια κοινῆς ἐπανορθώσεως τύχοι, τὰ  
γούν ἄλλα πιστεύομεν ὑμῖν ἔσεσθαι ἀγαθούς  
'and if, as a necessary consequence of  
this assurance and expectation, the  
contracts should be revised by us  
jointly, we are confident that in all  
other respects at least you will be good  
citizens.' Menenius Agrippa, in arguing  
for reconciliation between patricians  
and plebeians, has been stressing the  
'assurance' of common advantage and  
preservation, and comes to the passage  
quoted. Revision of the contracts  
would be against this assurance, Cary  
and Post argue. Post proposed κρείτ-  
τονα after ἐλπίδος: 'because of com-  
pulsion too strong for this assurance.'  
Cary suggests that ἀνάγκην may have  
replaced a word meaning 'inadequacy',  
'violation' or the like: if so, we might  
read δι' ἀγνοίαν τῆς πίστεως (cf. 85. 1  
μίαν (πίστιν) . . . οὔτε ἀγνοούμενην). But  
it is not the particular 'assurance'  
which Menenius has been discussing  
that Dionysius refers to here, but (as  
ἐλπίδος shows) assurance in general:  
'through the need for assurance and  
hope.' Spelman was closer to it: 'But,  
if there should be a necessity for a  
further assurance from an expectation  
of a benefit by reforming the joint  
agreement', etc.

It is well to remember that Dionysius  
used Roman sources. This may support  
Cary at vi. 50. 2 in reading εἰς πίστιν  
ἐλθόν (cf. *in fidem venire*), explain vi.  
65. 1 τῇ κρείττονι μερίδι, and encourage  
acceptance of τὰς at vi. 74. 6, which  
could refer to the thirty Latin cities  
(cf. vi. 63. 4, 75. 3). It is dangerous to  
forget that the constitutional problems  
in Dionysius have been treated by  
modern scholars outside the circle of  
textual critics. Cary's note on the  
tribes at vii. 64. 6, with its reference to  
an early view of Mommsen (quoted by  
Jacoby) which Mommsen later gave up,



is valueless: see Mommsen, *Staatsrecht*, iii. 166, n. 3, and Eduard Meyer, *Kleine Schriften*, i (1st ed.), 363, n. 2, for the only two possible explanations.

In conclusion two particularly interesting attempts at correction are worth quoting. The parable of the human body and the Roman State ends as follows (vi. 86. 5): καθάπερ . . . ἡ λοιδορούμενη κακῶς ὑπὸ τῶν πολλῶν γαστήρ (add. Sylburg) τρέφει τὸ σῶμα τρεφομένη καὶ σφίξει σφίζομένη, καὶ ἔστιν ὥσεί τις ἐστίασις κοινὴ τὸ πρόσφορον ἅπασιν (Reiske: ἀπάντων MSS.) ἐκ (Post: καὶ

MSS.) τῆς διαλλαγῆς ἀνταποδιδούσα (Post: αἷτιον ἀποδιδούσα MSS.), οὕτως . . . ἡ . . . βουλὴ κτλ.

The Roman triumph is compared with the Dionysiac revelry in Athens (vii. 72. 11): ἐφέϊται γὰρ τοῖς κατάγονσι τὰς νίκας ἱαμβίζειν . . . ὡς Ἀθῆναι τοῖς πομπευταῖς τοῖς ἐπὶ τῶν ἀμαξῶν, πρότερον ἀμέτροις (Post: ἅμα τοῖς MSS.) σκώμμασι παρορχουμένοις (MSS.: παρορχουμένοις Sylburg), νῦν δὲ ποιήματα ἄδουσιν αὐτοσχέδια.

A. H. McDONALD.

University of Sydney.

### GREEK LOGIC

Ernst KAPP: *Greek Foundations of Traditional Logic*. Pp. vii+95. New York: Columbia University Press (London: Milford), 1943. Cloth, 10s. net.

In this excellent short study the author examines in their historical context some of the main features of Aristotle's logic. A quotation may serve to show his method of approach. A logical doctrine 'should be easier to understand—and, if necessary, to criticize—if it is examined as it was first used and serving its original purpose than after it has been tampered with and adapted over and over again to the wants and needs of later times. There is only one indispensable requirement: we must have learned to explain a given classic passage from a given classical context, instead of trying to explain it by simply substituting traditional modern notions for original old ones' (p. 20). This is the most fruitful method (historically or philosophically) of dealing with ancient philosophy.

The author rightly insists on the importance as a background to Aristotle's logic of the fourth- and fifth-century 'dialectical' disputations, practised by the Sophists and by Socrates, represented by Plato in his dialogues, and continued by him in the Academy. To show the difference between Aristotelian and traditional logic he takes four main topics of traditional logic, terms (or concepts), propositions (or judgements), syllogism, and induction,

and considers Aristotle's views upon them. ὅρος is examined in its double meaning, as 'term', in which it derives from mathematical usage and is curiously unrelated to Aristotle's treatment of words and their meaning, and as 'definition', in which it is, basically, the answer to the Socratic τί ἐστι; The categories are explained as 'an attempt to differentiate for certain dialectical and philosophical purposes the sometimes misleading uniformity of grammatical predication' (p. 39). Such an attempt would follow naturally on Plato's treatment of sentences and judgements in the *Sophist*, and seems a likely origin of the doctrine, though Aristotle himself has extended it when he presents it in the *Categories* as a classification of the meanings of single words. Aristotle's treatment of judgements in the *De Interpretatione* is properly considered in relation to Plato's in the *Sophist*, but it seems a pity that no use is made of Cornford's treatment in his *Plato's Theory of Knowledge* or of his translation, which is more lucid than Jowett's. And Aristotle's view of the relation between νοήματα and language, written and spoken, is perhaps simpler than is allowed. Aristotle thought that in the mind were νοήματα, which were 'combined or separated' just as words are 'combined and separated' in language, and that it was this mental combination and separation which gave language its meaning, a simple, though false, view to which the

Aviary simile in the *Theaetetus* bears some relation (cf. my article in *Classical Quarterly*, xxxiii, 1939, pp. 208 ff.). The origin of syllogism is also found in dialectical disputation, and the *Analytics* are regarded as giving a theoretical systematization of dialectical practice. The old question, Can the syllogism lead to new knowledge? is disposed of by pointing out that Aristotle at any rate never supposed that it could. For him it was a method of explaining known facts by deriving them from known principles. So in dialectic the conclusion to be proved is known

throughout, the problem being to prove it. But we may also perhaps see here the influence of geometry, which was even to Aristotle the model science, a view which comes out strongly in the *Posterior Analytics*. For in geometry too the conclusion to be reached is known in advance: what is done is to find premises from which it can be proved. Induction ('the way from particular to universal') is treated more briefly and related to Socrates' inquiries, as it is by Aristotle himself.

H. D. P. LEE.

Corpus Christi College, Cambridge.

### GREEK AND ROMAN ARCHITECTURE

D. S. ROBERTSON: *A Handbook of Greek and Roman Architecture*. Second edition. Pp. 433; 135 line, 24 half-tone plates. Cambridge: University Press, 1943. Cloth, 31s. 6d. net.

It is extremely difficult in a brief review to do adequate justice to the second edition of a book already famed for its erudition. Many would be content to notice textual modifications and such references to recent research as the general framework of the subject allows. Others, eager to display their knowledge, might ask why certain buildings had not been illustrated. Both types of critics would be in the wrong; for scholarly books on art are not mere compilations, but are written with the dual purpose of recording facts and informing taste. It is no exaggeration to say that a book dealing with such a wide subject as classical architecture demands not only precision but clarity of expression.

Professor Robertson has set a very high standard. He places the student of classical archaeology and the practising architect very much in his debt. No doubt this has been said before in connexion with the first edition of his book, but it is opportune to say it again. At the present time civic architecture is badly in need of the stimulus of scholarship to retrieve it from vulgarity; almost as much in need, in fact, as it was in the darkest hours of the mid-nineteenth century. To-day it is

realized, somewhat tardily, that architectural knowledge cannot be put off and on like a cloak at a masquerade, that neither fashion nor excessive pursuit of function will provide the perennial result which thoughtful persons hope for.

For such reasons as these the book will be welcomed by everyone concerned with the period of reconstruction. Most people know the past to have a real and substantial quality which cannot be lightly set aside, and they understand the benefits of fusion of artistic qualities. They know too that exemplars of art are as essential to cultural progress as any dreams of future possibilities. In fine this new edition of Professor Robertson's work appears at the time when it is most needed. Further, it is exceedingly doubtful if a new book of similar purpose will be produced for many years.

If we examine the parallel which exists between certain aspects of architecture and archaeology we see at once how they are related. This applies particularly to those classical buildings of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries which in all countries are termed monumental. The reason for this is not far to seek. For nearly three centuries, since the Frenchman Jacques Carrey made his sketches of the Parthenon, interest in classical art has continually quickened. This in turn reacted on the development of civic and secular build-

ings in Europe and America. In time antiquarian research revealed the main facts of Minoan, Greek, Etruscan, and Roman architecture, showing each phase to be part of a trend which resulted ultimately in Romanesque and Byzantine development. Finally the true spirit of the Italian Renaissance was seen to be a return to the classical manner of old Rome.

In the nineteenth century it became the quest of archaeologists to concentrate on the hitherto obscure origins of classical art; hence the cumulative mass of detail and information familiar to the scholar but unknown to the vast majority of the public. With the widening of the field of research and with so many sub-interests, comprehensive details and precise information became necessary in the form of a handbook. The realization of this ideal was the aim of Professor Robertson in 1928, and many new students will be grateful for the present edition.

The general arrangement of the book and the selection of the illustrations, as well as the description of the buildings, present the subject in a way to appeal to the student. Few will fail to recognize the progressive spirit of classical architecture, never quite re-

peating itself, but ever aiming at new perfection.

Creation was the aim of the classical world, but it was creation based upon experience; it implied the abridgement and selection of plastic forms which came to be recognized as constants. It seems to have been the mission of classical art to educate succeeding ages to realize the meaning of beauty. True, there were periods of darkness, but the classical torch has time and again led dormant taste to the true path. Few would deny that classical art provides the universal language which makes art intelligible to the untutored. But the artists and designers of to-day, while welcoming all that scholarship can supply, are no longer content to imitate the forms which enchant their eyes. On the contrary the aim is to emulate qualities which are enduring.

Finally there is the value of this handbook to teachers. Not only will it be found authoritative, but the descriptions of individual buildings are never tedious. Study of the architecture of Greece and Rome is in itself inspiring, but when it forms part of a conscious quest for ordered beauty it cannot fail to give renewed confidence and hope for the future. A. E. RICHARDSON.

#### THE LOEB LIVY

*Livy*. With an English translation by F. G. MOORE. In thirteen volumes. Vol. VII: Books XXVI-XXVII. Pp. x+424, with 8 maps. (Loeb Classical Library.) London: Heinemann, 1943. Cloth, 10s. (leather, 12s. 6d.) net.

THE textual notes based upon the apparatus of the Oxford Text, the explanatory notes following De Sanctis, and the excellent series of maps help to make this volume serviceable.

The text shows care and judgement and only a few comments are necessary. At xxvi. 6. 8 there is little need to add *quidam*. Why add *agenda* at 7. 6 and not *inexpiabilis* at 13. 9? At 13. 15 Müller's *in carce(re) expi'rem* deserves more notice; at 35. 3 *privatim* should stand. Conway's conjectures at 38. 4 and 46. 1 are perhaps too bold for what is generally a conservative text. At

51. 2 *navem* is well restored, in view of the other evidence for a different source in xxvii. 7. 4, which is quoted by Conway. It is a matter of choice and consistency at xxvii. 9. 13 and 12. 3 to read *quod* instead of *quid*. At 26. 1 *haberet* has claims. At 45. 11 'nec abire ab signis nec subsistere nisi cibum capientes' may well be the best reading, though Conway makes out a good case for 'nec ab signis absistere cibum capientes'.

The textual notes are accurate and well chosen. On xxvii. 2. 2 the note might have indicated that Conway and Johnson printed *contuderit* with *exsultet* and suggested *contudisset* only with *exsultaret*; on 3. 3 their punctuation might have been mentioned; on 9. 3 read 'quid Conway'.

The explanatory notes are full and

useful. In xxvii. 8. 17, a late annalistic passage, the difficult *Romani* is as likely to be false history as a slip for *Graeci*. On 9. 7 add Salmon, *J.R.S.* xxvi (1936), 55 f. The references to De Sanctis, *Storia dei Romani*, vol. iii, pt. 2, might include the following important notes. On xxvi. 12. 2 and the case for *per Samnium*, not *per Samnium Apuliamque*, see p. 342; on *Ausetanis* at 17. 4 see p. 451, note 15; on *Larinatis* at xxvii. 40. 10 see pp. 457 ff.; on *ad Senam* at 46. 4 see p. 563.

The translation, however, is poor. Phrases are rendered in detail, but not always accurately and too often without relation to the context. Examples occur on every page: it will be enough to cite one or two. xxvi. 1. 10 describes how the defeated army of Cn. Fulvius was degraded to the status of the *legiones Cannenses*: in this context *foede* with *caesus fugatusque* is not 'terribly' but 'dishonourably', *huic generi militum* is not 'soldiers of this sort' but 'this class of soldier', and *additum . . . ignominiae* is not 'added to the disgrace' but 'an additional mark of dis-

grace'. At xxvii. 12. 12 'cotidie simul orientem solem et Romanam aciem in campis videndam esse' the Roman battle-line is said to appear every morning—in Apulia of all places—in the meadows'.

There is a lot of unnecessary clumsiness due to keeping the Latin order when a slight change would give good English. For example, at xxvii. 12. 2 'Fabius qui et conlegam coram obtestatus et per litteras Marcellum ut quam acerrimo bello detinerent Hannibalem' is rendered: 'Fabius who in person implored his colleague and by letter Marcellus also to keep Hannibal occupied by the most spirited fighting'. Why not write balanced English and say: 'Fabius who implored his colleague in person and Marcellus by letter'? Further, *quam acerrimo bello* is 'by the most spirited fighting possible'. These criticisms are not trivial; for when sentence after sentence falls into the same unnatural order, the effect as a whole is intolerable.

A. H. McDONALD.

University of Sydney.

#### CLASSICAL STUDIES

*Classical Studies in Honor of William Abbott Oldfather*. Pp. vii+217; portrait, 7 plates. Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois Press, 1943. Cloth, \$4.

IF we may borrow an idea from the second study in this book—on 'The Entitulation of Pre-Ciceronian Writings'—we may at once raise the question whether 'Satura' should not be at least an alternative title. For 'Satura' it certainly is—a savoury dish composed of many ingredients, of tastes and properties the most diverse. In approaching such a book any conscientious reviewer must feel some degree of humility, for he will certainly not be competent to do justice to it at every point. He may perhaps be forgiven if he acknowledges his deficiency, reports fairly on the whole work, but focuses his interest where he is most sure of understanding and appreciating.

More special studies are represented by 'The Anonymous Diagnosis of Ptolemaic Geography' by Professor

Aubrey Diller, 'On the Manuscripts of the Philogelos' by Professor B. E. Perry, 'Some Remarks on the Provenience of Codex Bezae' by Dr. Robert C. Stone, and 'The A-Family in the Text Tradition of the Anonymous Liber de Viris Illustribus' by Professor John B. Titchener. Professor A. S. Pease contributes a short but illuminating paper on 'Indirect Discourse in Caesar'. Dr. F. P. Johnson describes with care 'A Pelike Painted by Hermonax'. Is it unfair to suggest here that interpretation of scenes is best left unattempted until some real clue has been obtained? Professor George Mylonas writes of 'The Lykaian Altar of Zeus'—of sinister fame for the human sacrifice attributed to it. He has some interesting suggestions to make on the fascinating, but almost completely uncertain, symbolism of trees, pillars, votaries, and sacred fruits of Minoan and Mycenaean art. Whether the eagle as emblem of a personal god began as an



*Augenblicksgott* is surely beyond our present powers of divination. Professor Kenneth Abbott writes with candour and knowledge about 'The Grammarians and the Latin Accent'. He has convinced at least one reader that nothing certain can yet be known about it. 'The Entitulature of Pre-Ciceronian Writings', by Professor Lloyd Daly, shows how far from fixed were the names of many works of literature. But he perhaps exaggerates the uncertainty by not bringing into account the drama, where names of plays were usually certain. Dr. Marian Harman, writing on 'Classical Elements in Early Printers' Marks', gives some interesting examples of the survival of classical symbols in this form. In some cases the symbol has been either innocently misunderstood or deliberately twisted. The dolphin and anchor of Roman coins of Titus had no original connexion with the motto *σπεῦδε βραδέως* with which it was associated by the famous Aldus Manutius. The crab and butterfly of Augustus' moneyer, M. Durmius, carried for Frellon a similar significance: he adds in explanation the word 'Matura'. What it meant for Durmius we do not know—but hardly that.

Other papers—in some cases perhaps less packed with learning—yield ready entertainment and amusement. 'Accidents and Fatalities in Greek Athletics' by Professor Clarence A. Forbes makes excellent reading. One shudders at the hazards encountered by wrestlers, boxers, and pancratiasts. In the list of accidents to charioteers one misses that of Nero at Olympia! But, no doubt, he sustained no permanent injury. Professor Richmond Lattimore, on 'Aeschylus on the Defeat of Xerxes', seems to be successful in demonstrating how the facts of the war have been gently distorted to enhance the fame of Athens. But are Aeschylus' 'Ionians' as definitely to be identified with Athenians as Professor Lattimore suggests? A careful study of 'Roman Military Exemption' by Professor L. R. Lind reveals a certain lack of sure general principles underlying *vacatio*. One notes with satisfaction that he questions the possi-

bility of really applying the details of the 'Servian' constitution to the sixth century B.C., and that he points out the very great difficulty of supposing that, before Marius, recruitment actually went by property qualification. 'The Development of Humanitarianism in Roman Law', by Professor H. C. Montgomery, traces its subject along three lines, the treatment of the child, the wife, and the slave. The conclusion reached seems reasonable enough—that the humane mitigations of law in later times must not lead us to attribute inhumanity to the earlier age. The *prisci mores* of Rome, with all their harshness, contained their own remedies.

Finally, three articles take us well beyond the classical period—those on 'Petrarch's Prestige as a Humanist' by Dr. R. P. Oliver, on 'The Influence of the Greeks on Nietzsche' by Dr. Alfreda Stallman, and 'The Influence of the Classics on Camões' *Lusiadas*' by Dr. Mary L. Trowbridge. The fact that Petrarch failed to achieve a Latin style that could command full respect from his contemporaries should be some consolation to the many since him who have met the same failure. As for Nietzsche and the Greeks, Dr. Stallman makes us feel that that great and tragic man went, as so many do, to Hellas to recognize in that rich and wonderful world ideas and ideals already grounded in his mind. 'Dionysiac man'—what would a Hellene have made of him? Curious and rather surprising are Nietzsche's great dislike of Socrates and his acceptance of Epicurus—surely a very, very gentle 'superman'. Dr. Trowbridge's writing on Camões makes the reader understand how well worth study even a late and highly artificial epic may be.

This handsomely equipped book will certainly give pleasure to many, including, no doubt, the very distinguished scholar to whom it is presented. It bears clear witness to the width of the field to which he has had access and of the vitality of the interests that have gone out from his circle.

HAROLD MATTINGLY.

British Museum.

THE LATER ATTIC *PHYLAE*

W. Kendrick PRITCHETT: *The Five Attic Tribes after Kleisthenes*. Pp. 39. Baltimore: privately printed, 1943. Paper.

IN this 'Dissertation submitted to the Board of University Studies of the Johns Hopkins University' Mr. Pritchett, one of the best known of the younger group of American epigraphist-historians, reprints as Chapters I and II two valuable articles, on Antigonis and Demetrias and on Ptolemais, which were published in *A.J.P.* lxi (1940) and lxiii; and adds to them two more chapters on Attalis and Hadrianis, thus completing the quintet. The first chapter is concerned with the allocation of demes to the two *phylae*: that to Demetrias may now be considered complete, since the probable bouleutic representation of the various demes amounts to about 50; but Antigonis still falls short of its complement by about 10, and other demes may still have to be assigned to it.

The second chapter has double value, for its first part is a detailed discussion, supported by a hitherto unpublished inscription from the Agora, of the date of the creation of Ptolemais. Pritchett decides for 224-223, and though present circumstances prevent me from investigating this afresh, to me it seems convincing—or, at the least, his arguments against Dinsmoor's dating in 226-225 seem convincing; and we have besides a new *terminus ante quem* given by *I.G.* ii<sup>2</sup>. 917, which is to be dated 223-222. There follows a brief discussion of the demes (including those newly formed), and of the trittys-organization, probably not used after the fourth century, with a note on the vexed question whether the trittyes had been contiguous areas within them-

selves or included isolated demes or enclaves. (There seems to be an error in the text here, p. 27, n. 56: 'the theory of enclaves . . . involves an emendation in Strabo, ix. 21, p. 398'; both theories involve some emendation, at least if we must assume in Strabo the official spelling, but it is the other and more probable one of contiguous trittyes which involves emending the MSS. reading 'Ἀζηνεῖς to Ἀττηνεῖς.) Similarly the next two chapters give us the composition of Attalis (created in 200 B.C.) and of the opsigious Hadrianis (created in A.D. 124-5, as shown by Graindor).

All the assignments of demes are accompanied by detailed evidence for each, so that we have all the material before us, which is most valuable. There is much that is new here, and previous work, including that of Bates, is to some extent superseded.

It will be noticed that this dissertation is strictly limited in its aim, though satisfactorily complete in attaining it. Pritchett does not for example discuss the effect of the creation of the new *phylae* on the bouleutic representation of each *phyle*, nor whether the new distribution of demes throws any light on population changes in *phylae* or demes or on the principles of deme-representation in the boule; nor does he tell us what became of the demes in Antigonis and Demetrias after the abolition of these *phylae* in 201. We can only hope that he will be able to resume his fruitful researches after the war.

I suppose there is no hope of inducing scholars to drop the use of the word 'tribe' for these highly artificial divisions of Greek states?

A. W. GOMME.

University of Glasgow.

## GREEK POLITICAL MEETING-PLACES

William A. McDONALD: *The Political Meeting Places of the Greeks*. (Johns Hopkins Studies in Archaeology, No. 34.) Pp. xix+308; 19 plates, 31 illustrations in text. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press (London: Milford), 1943. Cloth, 30s. net.

It is curious that while so much has been written about the political assemblies of the Greeks, so little attention has been paid to their meeting-places. Even Dr. McDonald's four-page bibliography consists mainly of general treatises and of descriptions of parti-

cular  
infor  
plent  
rhet  
ture  
acco  
expl  
mass  
large  
of de  
place  
sulta  
small  
tectu  
Meg  
as i  
Eleu  
boule  
sanc  
venie  
built  
No  
with  
and  
the  
fresc  
and  
show  
was  
opin  
expe  
seem  
Minc  
H  
diti  
men  
ther  
at L  
temp  
the  
Hell  
mean  
a 'm  
ἀγο  
ζευ,  
in H  
duce  
of th  
of pe  
disp  
term  
brou  
publ  
thos  
betl

cular sites. Yet there is plenty of information in excavators' reports, plenty of allusion in historical and rhetorical literature, and a large literature on Greek theatres, which so often accommodated political meetings. The explanation appears to be that the large mass-meetings of citizens were too large to be held anywhere except out of doors—in a theatre, in the market-place, on the hill-side—and the consultative and executive bodies were too small to require any building of architectural importance. The Thersileion at Megalopolis was as exceptional, in plan as in function, as the *telesterion* at Eleusis; and several of the best-known *bouleuteria* were those of the greater sanctuaries, where there was no convenient building available as in the built-up centre of a city.

No apology was needed for beginning with the 'Theatral Areas' of Knossos and Phaestos, and the great staircase of the palace at Mallia; for Knossian frescoes illustrate Minoan assemblies and even what seems to be voting by show of hands; 'palatial' government was compatible with respect for public opinion. And in Crete, as might be expected, the rock-cut steps at Lato seem to be the missing link between Minoan and classical.

Homeric *ἀγοραί* held under war conditions required no permanent equipment; but at Pylos and in Scheria there are stone seats, and in Scheria, as at Lato, the *ἀγορή* was attached to a temple or cult area; and on the 'shield' the circle of stones was 'sacred'. In Hellenic times, *ἀγορά* seems to have meant an 'assembly' quite as early as a 'market'; if not earlier, judging from *ἀγορεύειν*, which is Homeric, and *ἀγοράζειν*, which is only fifth-century: *ἀγείρειν* in Homer 'collects' either men or produce, and determines the first meaning of the substantive. It was the growth of political institutions and outlook that displaced the political *ἀγορά* by specific terms like *ἐκκλησία* and *ἀλή* (p. 37), and brought it into new connexions with other public functions, and especially with those of the *θέατρον*, whatever it might be that the assembly met to see or to hear.

Here the practice of Athens is instructive, because so very haphazard, with its meetings at Colonus, its extemporized *περισχοίνισμα* for ostracisms, its use of the theatres at Athens itself and at Munychia, and of the dockyard or a building in it. The Pnyx has its own problems of initial arrangement and of reconstruction. Only in later town-planning do we encounter a specific *Ἐκκλησιαστήριον*, as at Priene and at Delos.

The very large meetings customary in the federal leagues presented fresh difficulties of accommodation, and ingenious solutions like the Thersileion at Megalopolis with its radial arrangement of columns, and presumably central place for speakers. An interesting survival is the name Stratus in Acarnania, and the *Φωκικόν*, which are mere localities like that of the Althing in Iceland.

Quite a different matter is the location and equipment of the *βουλή* which every Greek city may be presumed to have had, as its inner circle of political authority, initially independent of the *πρυτανεῖον*, but frequently merged with it, when the original *πρυτανίς* gave place to other types of executive. These deliberative and probouleutic bodies were smaller, and more easily accommodated architecturally; they also met frequently, kept records, adjourned for a common meal, and required special seats for functionaries. But at Athens *βουλαί* were summoned in all sorts of places, as convenience required. For *βουλευτήρια* the evidence, though fragmentary, is copious, as we should expect; and at Athens recent excavation has made possible a complicated historical retrospect.

After setting out the evidence, site by site, and discussing local features in their place, Dr. McDonald summarizes a few general conclusions in relation to the prescriptions of Vitruvius. The main upshot is to confirm the remarkable freedom of invention and adaptation to circumstances which Greek architects enjoyed. Classification into 'long' and 'broad' buildings does not take us far. More significant of

construction is the variety of column lay-out within the main walls; but it does not account for buildings like that described by Libanius in Asia Minor, which was hypaethral: it was sun, not wind or rain, that ancient meetings had to avoid most often.

Dr. McDonald has carried out a laborious task with great industry and care, and his book will for long be a work of reference.

JOHN L. MYRES.

Oxford.

### CLEPSYDRA

Arthur Wellesley PARSONS: *Klepsydra and the Paved Court of the Pythion*. (Johns Hopkins dissertation.) Reprinted from *Hesperia*, vol. xii. Pp. 191-267; 42 figures. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1943. Paper.

THIS valuable monograph by the excavator of Clepsydra, now Director of the American School of Classical Studies in Athens, was produced under difficulties, since part of the material, including pottery important for dating, is inaccessible in Greece. This only means, however, that a little more must be taken on trust than the writer could have wished, and the most critical reader will find nothing to provoke scepticism.

The exploration of this important site on the northern face of the Acropolis was begun in 1937 by the American excavators of the Agora in view of a government proposal to ring the Acropolis with a scenic boulevard. The results, briefly announced in *Hesperia*, especially in 1939, were very important, and make even such recent discussions as that in the 1931 edition of Judeich's *Topographie von Athen* completely obsolete. Nothing can here be attempted but a summary of the writer's conclusions.

It is now certain that the underground basin of the spring, preserved almost intact, was built about 460 B.C., and was originally approached, as Burnouf guessed seventy years ago, from the west. It could not be reached from the top of the Acropolis till the existing vaulted well-house and stairway were constructed in the late second century A.D., though Cimon seems to have hoped to include it in his fortifications. The well-house, later made a chapel of the Holy Apostles, stood high

above the basin, among the masses of limestone which fell when the old rock-roof over the basin collapsed.

The complicated medieval history was luckily illuminated by the find of nine bronze coins of Guillaume Villehardouin, evidently dropped into wet mortar by a careless mason: they prove the erection of a Frankish fortification in the middle of the thirteenth century, anticipating the famous Bastion which Odysseus Andritzos erected during the War of Independence, after the rediscovery by Pittakis of the well-house, whose disappearance under Turkish rule cost the Turkish garrison of the Acropolis dear in 1821.

It has also been shown that the spring is singularly steady, so that ancient statements about its ebb and flow must be fanciful explanations of its later name (Clepsydra, after Empedo). Clepsydra must have meant something like 'stealthily flowing water'. Other things that text-books must drop are the suggestion that its overflow worked the water-clock in the Horologium of Andronicus, and the inscription ΦΥΝΙΧΟ, which Pittakis thought he read on the well-beam, as he dangled precariously by candlelight over the black water.

Much of the treatise deals with the paved court beside the basin, first found by Cavvadias in 1897. This is plausibly explained as a sort of *pompeion*, connected with the occasional *theoria Pythais*, which may well have started from this sanctuary, above which lies the Cave of Apollo.

The treatise is well illustrated with photographs, plans, and sections, and has a useful appendix of Testimonia.

D. S. ROBERTSON.

Trinity College, Cambridge.



## CHIOS

Hieronimo Giustiniani's *History of Chios*. Edited with an Introduction by Philip P. ARGENTI. Pp. xxxv+462. Cambridge: University Press, 1943. Cloth, 42s. net.

To the long list of contributions which Dr. Argenti has made to the history of his native island he has now added the present *History of Chios*. A French version of the book was made and printed in 1586; now the lost original Italian manuscript, with a preface signed by the author, has been discovered by the present editor in the State Archives at Rome, where it had been deposited by the Roman branch of the Giustiniani family. Here then we have the original Italian text, containing a great deal of material which is not in the French version. To make such an abridgement, for the French version appears to be hardly more, would be extremely easy, as Giustiniani was much given to digressions. Of this he was himself very well aware, for in a note *Al Lettore* he defends himself by saying that he inserts them, everything, it would almost seem, that he could find in his notebooks, in order that the reader be not bored by having all the time to read the simple, bare history of the island, but may return to it with spirits refreshed, awakened, and delighted by the author's *varie osservazioni*. This character of the book puts a great strain on the index, if the reader is to get ready access to the mass of curious lore introduced into the narrative, and one would have welcomed the full notes that the editor was certainly well qualified to give us. Partly from brevity the index contains a few errors in detail. *Cumara* is called just a *bush*; it hardly needs the text with its *frutto molto dolce* to see that it is in fact the arbutus (κούμαρον). *Flaschomigliá* is not a beverage, but the sage plant, which bears agreeably flavoured galls; as the text tells us, *delle poma dolci quasi il zucharo*. It does not matter much that in the few passages where the Turkish alphabet is used, it is not used

without mistakes. In view of the heterogeneous nature of the work, headlines or some analysis of the contents would have been very welcome; as it is, almost all that the editor has given us of himself is an able and extremely interesting introduction, but it is not more than 35 pages. In it he contrives to hit off Giustiniani's character with a sure touch. He points out that his position throughout is that of a man who takes as natural and for granted the Italian Catholic point of view in everything: within these limits 'his knowledge is encyclopaedic and his curiosity voracious, but beyond that a child could hardly be more ignorant'.

Although Giustiniani begins with the statement that Chios was settled by the descendants of Noah, and starts off with his grandson Javan who gave his name to Ionia, as a history the book really begins with the Turkish occupation in 1566, although in essentials it is not so much a history as a description of Chios as the author knew it: Dr. Argenti thinks he may well have been one of the Chiotes allowed to return to the island as subjects of the Sultan.

The digressions make the book rather like a lucky bag from which almost anything may be drawn. Here is an example. Beginning on p. 145 we find a disquisition on death and funeral customs of many countries, various views on the next world, and an account of the *post-mortem* ceremonies of the Greek Church; this ends with a dialogue which he presents as held by Turks over a dead body with the dead man's pretended answers, all in Turkish: after fifteen pages of all this we come to a quotation from Pliny, that the bodies of men float supine, those of women face downwards. In the next chapter we get back to Chios with an account of the Delphic oracle as it concerned the wedding of a queen of Chios to an Armenian king called Dragone: next follows a discussion of marriage customs. And the index will show plenty more such digressions, *per*

*recreare gli spiriti vostri*, as the author puts it in his defence for such a way of writing a History of Chios.

Finally, the book is admirably printed by the Cambridge Press, and will

be most good reading to all those who are interested in the ways and manners of that half-Italianized Levant.

R. M. DAWKINS.

Exeter College, Oxford.

### MEDIEVAL PLATONISM

(1) Paul Oskar KRISTELLER: *The Philosophy of Marsilio Ficino*. (Columbia Studies in Philosophy, No. 6.) Pp. xiv+441. New York: Columbia University Press (London: Milford), 1943. Cloth, 30s. net.

(2) *Mediaeval and Renaissance Studies*. Edited by R. HUNT and R. KLIBANSKY. Vol. I, No. 2. London: Warburg Institute. Paper, 18s. net.

(1) FICINO, leader of the Platonic Academy at Florence, known dimly nowadays to classical scholars for his translations of Plato and Plotinus, did more than anyone else by his writings to popularize the philosophy of Plato, in its Neoplatonic guise, both in his own day and for many generations afterwards. In this painstaking analysis of his philosophic teaching Kristeller suggests that Ficino was a thinker of power and originality on his own account. But he makes it plain that Ficino inherited a great deal of Aristotelianism, in its medieval developments, and it was on this foundation that he built a formidable, and not very consistent, eclecticism, in which he incorporated such novelties as his doctrine of 'Platonic love' in the sense of 'intellectual love between friends'. Kristeller writes for those who have scant sympathy with Platonic and Aristotelian thought, whether on causality

or 'the concept of a substantial Soul' or similar topics; and the length of the book is due to the consequent necessity of explaining such matters, which formed a common stock of ideas for Christian medieval and renaissance thinkers. Hence it must be admitted that Ficino's originality does not stand out very clearly, and there is perhaps insufficient space assigned to criticism and evaluation of his distinctive contribution, such as it was.

(2) Some helpful clues towards such criticism are afforded by a good article by R. Klibansky in this number of *Mediaeval and Renaissance Studies*. He not only gives an account of the medieval and renaissance knowledge of the *Parmenides*, but adds an interesting historical summary of the position of Ficino and of those who opposed his Neoplatonizing version of Plato, such as Pico, Patrizzi, and Leibniz who 'paved the way for a new approach to Plato'. Other articles of indirect interest to classical students include an investigation of the legend of 'Parmenides' Rock' (Klibansky), a new identification of Boethius' translation of Aristotle's *Categories* (Minio-Paluello), and notes on medieval studies of Priscian (Hunt).

J. TATE.

University of St. Andrews.

### SHORT REVIEWS

William Kelly PRENTICE: *Those Ancient Dramas Called Tragedies*. Pp. 194; 2 plates. Princeton: University Press (London: Milford), 1942. Cloth, 16s. 6d. net.

THIS is a book addressed to the general reader. After an introductory chapter on the origin of tragedy, the author deals with three or four selected plays from each of the three tragic poets. He gives a detailed summary of the plot of each; except with the *P.V.*, *Oresteia*, and *O.T.*, discussion and criticism do not amount to very much. The author thinks that in the *P.V.* Aeschylus is

suggesting, cautiously, that 'Zeus' is a crude conception invented by mankind in its infancy, which he will outgrow, led by Intelligence (Prometheus)—a view which is possible only if one agrees with the writer that the play, whether part of a trilogy or not, is complete in itself. The discussion of the *Oresteia* is hampered by an unexpected recrudescence of Verrallism: 'The only reason I can discover or imagine for rejecting Verrall's explanation [of the beacon] is a passionate desire to believe in the historicity of the fire-post.'

Professor Prentice hardly comes to grips with Sophocles, or he would not say, three times, that Sophocles 'attempts no solution' of the problems he deals with: 'I do not think that Sophocles considered either the moral or the political implications of the story at all'—this on the *Antigone*.

In general the criticism does not take one very far. The most interesting chapter is one on the legend of Oedipus, in which it is argued that the kernel of the story was the marriage of a son with a mother, and that Oedipus was a nature-spirit, *mois* connoting the root of the growing plant.

H. D. F. KITTO.

University of Glasgow.

J. T. SHEPPARD: *Aeschylus, the Prophet of Greek Freedom*. An essay on the Oresteian trilogy. Pp. 64. London: Murby, 1943. Paper, 2s. net.

WHEN Mr. Sheppard writes on Aeschylus, he needs no commendation to readers of the *Classical Review*. In this short essay he gives a close and imaginative analysis of the *Oresteia*; an analysis which, as always, is vivified by his subtle understanding of Aeschylus' style and imagery, and by his experience of the plays in the theatre. The aspect under which the plays are treated here is that 'they illustrate . . . life's nobler possibilities and man's unconquerable impulse to create a kinder world. . . . By free submission to a rule of law (Athena) bids us strive to build an order of society in which youth, freedom, truth, and beauty are not sacrificed, and force becomes our servant, not our master and destroyer'. If any young people read the *Oresteia*, or parts of it, to-day, it would be difficult to suggest a better short introduction to it than this.

H. D. F. KITTO.

University of Glasgow.

T. F. HIGHAM and C. M. BOWRA: *From the Greek*. Pp. viii+246. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1943. Cloth, 4s. net.

THIS little book contains a selection of poems from *The Oxford Book of Greek Verse in Translation* with a short preface pointing out the various ways in which Greek poetry is specially apposite at the present time. As the original volume was reviewed in this journal on its appearance in 1938, all that is needed now is to consider whether this selection is suitable for its purpose of appealing to a wider public and especially, as stated on the cover, to members of the Services, and thereby contributes to relief work in Greece. On this point the reader who knows no Greek is perhaps the best judge, for it is hard otherwise to get away from the associations of the original and to estimate how a given passage will strike a reader who comes to it fresh and judges it on its merits in the English version. So far as a reviewer with the disadvantage (for this purpose) of knowing Greek can judge, the selection is very good. Nearly all the passages contain something which should interest any lover of poetry, and many have real merit as English verse. The passages which lose most by detachment from their context are those from Greek Tragedy, but that is probably inevitable. It may

be worth adding that the selection passed one test which I devised. I thought out some passages in the original volume which should infallibly interest any intelligent reader, and on inspection I found that these passages had been included.

Thanks to the fine paper on which it is printed the book makes a very slender volume in spite of its 246 pages, and should tempt any one who wants to know more of the Greeks, not to mention those who already know them, to slip it into his pocket.

F. R. EARP.

*Poems from the Greek Anthology*. Translated by Forrest REID. Pp. 72. London: Faber, 1943. Cloth, 5s. net.

DR. JOHNSON according to Boswell often solaced a sleepless night by turning poems from the *Greek Anthology* into Latin verse, and there are countless classical scholars who have at some time or other tried their hand at rendering their favourite epigrams into English, and not a few have published their versions. In this pleasing little volume Mr. Forrest Reid, deserting his wonted literary paths, gives us a translation of some hundred and thirty poems chosen from all parts of the collection.

Unlike most translators Mr. Reid translates into prose, but, since he states that he has rendered them for his own pleasure (and not for our benefit), we have no reason to complain, though it is difficult not to feel that the only satisfactory medium is verse.

The translator into verse must necessarily be allowed a certain licence owing to the exigencies of metre; but the translator into prose should adhere as closely as possible to his original. Mr. Reid is apt to wander from his text; for example in translating Meleager's poem to the grasshopper (vii. 195), he renders, 'Locust . . . charmer of my dreams; locust . . . harmonious winged lyre of nature, play me the tune I love, striking with your tiny feet your singing wings'. Here there seems no reason for departing from the literal meaning, viz., 'Locust . . . persuader of sleep, locust . . . shrill-voiced, Nature's mimic of the lyre, play me some song of love, striking with your dear little feet your chattering wings'.

On p. 46, for xii. 87 read xii. 78; also, the second epigram on p. 70, according to the system adopted by the translator (see p. 11), should be numbered xvi. 341.

EDWARD S. FORSTER.

University of Sheffield.

Sister Rose de Lima HENRY: *The Late Greek Optative and its Use in the Writings of Gregory Nazianzen*. (Catholic University of America Patristic Studies, Vol. LXVIII.) Pp. xx+108. Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1943. Paper, \$2.

\*GREEK is essentially homogeneous and late Greek . . . is but a natural stage in its development. . . . Late literary Greek is neither Attic nor artificial but represents the ultimate term of an evolution which turning from Attic syntax in

Polybius entered upon its final phase in . . . Gregory Nazianzen and his contemporaries.' The author's purpose is 'to present as much of the syntax of the optative from Homer to Byzantine times as would supply a provisional background from which to judge the nature of Gregory's usage'. The optatives in Gregory are classified, with an account of each type in Homer; Attic; Attic Inscriptions; the dialects; the Ptolemaic papyri, LXX, N.T., Apostolic Fathers, apocryphal N.T., and later non-literary papyri; and the late authors. Then follow statistics of Gregory's usage in each type, and conclusions based on comparison of this with Attic and the dialects. For classical syntax seven works are used. 'The varied opinions and points of view on almost every phase of Attic syntax are amazing. The writer has attempted to present these impartially making no decision between them.' Five N.T. grammars are cited and 'their classification has been accepted whether the writer agrees . . . or not' . . . unless 'the evidence presented here is overwhelmingly against their views'. For late authors—Theophrastus to Psellus—'the evidence of forty-one studies is gathered impartially and objectively'. Such claims to objectivity might seem an abdication of judgement, and a mosaic of discrepant opinions a Protean basis for comparison. Yet the reviews of authorities on certain periods, e.g. the unique survey of studies of late authors, are valuable; and within the limitations so candidly confessed the author shows more originality and sound judgement in synthesis and deduction than are often found in statistical theses of this sort. A bibliography and two indexes are added.

P. B. R. FORBES.

University of Edinburgh.

*Corpus Vasorum Antiquorum*: United States of America, fasc. 9. The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, fasc. 1. Arretine Relief Ware. By Christine ALEXANDER. Pp. 28; 48 plates. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press (London: Milford), 1943. Cloth and boards, \$5.

THE first fascicle of the Metropolitan Museum is devoted to Arretine relief ware. The text is workmanlike and good; the pictures of stamps, moulds, and vases could not be bettered. In fact this fascicle shows the need of further good pictures of Arretine vases and moulds in other museums. They raise interesting problems on which Miss Alexander is always interesting and sensible. Apart from the question of the adaptation of the same stamps to different scenes (always a common procedure in plastic terra-cottas), there are larger issues. How are they related to contemporary silver ware? How are they related to contemporary sculpture and painting? How are they related to earlier works of art? A casual glance shows some connexion between the masks and swags here and on fourth-century vases, between the satyrs here and Hellenistic prototypes, between the Kalathiskos dancers here and the late-fifth-century sculpture, between the Nereids here and the Eretria painter's Nereids. Is the carrier of this influence always silver-ware

and, still more important, what additional information can Arretine give us about earlier periods of Greek art?

T. B. L. WEBSTER.

University of Manchester.

*Corpus Vasorum Antiquorum*: United States of America, fasc. 10. M. H. de Young Memorial Museum and California Palace of the Legion of Honour, San Francisco. By H. R. W. SMITH. Pp. 57; 30 plates. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press (London: Milford), 1943. Cloth and boards, \$5.

THIS fascicle of the *Corpus Vasorum* is as good as, if not better than, the California fascicle which Smith has already published. The thirty plates are admirable; they are clean and clear and have a wealth of general and detailed views of every important vase. The text gives full descriptions and a learned commentary with quotation of relevant literature on every point of interest. All students of vase painting will have to read this fascicle with attention, since it contains a great deal more of information, scholarship, and argument than was strictly necessary for publishing the San Francisco vases. Of the vases themselves the most noteworthy are a black-figured Amazonomachy, with a scene on the back in which it is just possible that Polycrates should be recognized; a rather later amphora by the Antiope painter; two pelikai near the Niobid painter (the second with a very good commentary by Smith on the history of a particular motive); and a bell crater of the mid-fifth-century—a shape which we are told to call a lugged crater in future.

T. B. L. WEBSTER.

University of Manchester.

F. S. BOAS: *Aspects of Classical Legend and History in Shakespeare*. (British Academy Shakespeare Lecture, 1943.) Pp. 28. London: Milford, 1943. Paper, 3s. net.

NO doubt assiduous consultation of the Shakespeare Concordance would have enabled anyone to collect the material for this lecture, but few except Dr. Boas could so adroitly have arranged the pieces in so pleasant a mosaic. But even a mosaic is the better for having a design as well as harmonious juxtapositions of colour, and it is not clear what Dr. Boas's design is. When we have finished enjoying ourselves, are we meant to be clearer about the source of Shakespeare's knowledge, or the extent of it, or the extent of his audience's knowledge? A consideration of Stratford school-books is barely relevant. Given a mind as absorbent as Shakespeare's, an hour in the 'Mermaid', where the air—particularly if Jonson was present—might at any moment be thick with classical allusions, or half an hour with an educated patron, would do much to supplement his inadequate grounding. The interesting point is surely the last. As Dr. Boas says, 'The audience in the Globe or the Blackfriars must have been remarkably "quick in the uptake" to seize the allusion'. They must have been, and presumably they were. (The Latin line in Faustus' last speech, for example,

is w  
app  
wres  
tras  
prac  
Shay  
spea  
Shal  
Shal  
clim  
ides  
'the  
he s  
Milt  
like  
not a

Bo

Geon

the

Ur

Dr.

peter

In th

in th

the

espec

the p

Churc

vario

In th

mean

accou

differ

New

ture

Dr.

found

in fac

until

then

Churc

teachi

There

leadin

writte

cause

Christ

The

literat

author

B. W

(1) stu

List 15

assignm



is worse than pointless unless the audience could appreciate the savage irony with which it is wrested from its original context.) And the contrast which Dr. Boas draws with another highly practical dramatist, Shaw, does not imply that Shaw knows less classical mythology than Shakespeare, but that his audience knows less than Shakespeare's audience knew. Dr. Boas criticizes Shakespeare for speaking of Hercules 'Still climbing trees in the Hesperides'. 'The Hesperides were, of course' (that dangerous 'of course'!) 'the guardians of the fruit'. If Shakespeare erred he at least erred in scholarly company, since Milton's 'Ladies of th' *Hesperides*' shows that he, like Mela, could regard the Hesperides as a place, not as maidens.

M. R. RIDLEY.

Balliol College, Oxford.

George JOHNSTON: *The Doctrine of the Church in the New Testament*. Pp. xvi+156. Cambridge: University Press, 1943. Cloth, 10s. 6d. net.

DR. JOHNSTON'S dissertation is a lucid and competent study of a subject of first-rate importance. In the first part he deals with the relevant factors in the Graeco-Roman and Jewish environments of the Early Church, noting points of similarity especially with the Synagogue, but emphasizing the points of difference which did divide the Church from the Synagogue as well as from the various cult-societies of contemporary paganism. In the second part, after a discussion of the meaning of the word *ἐκκλησία*, we have a careful account of the positive content given to it at the different stages of development covered by the New Testament and other early Christian literature down to the middle of the second century.

Dr. Johnston takes the view that Jesus is the founder of the Church, but that the Church did not in fact become actual—and indeed could not—until after the Crucifixion and Resurrection. He then goes on to examine the conceptions of the Church held in the Primitive Community, in the teaching of Paul, and in the sub-Apostolic age. There are two detached notes: one on Ephesians, leading to the conclusion that it could have been written by Paul, but was not; the other showing cause for regarding the Syriac word 'Ēdā' as a Christian coinage.

The work shows wide knowledge of the relevant literature as well as close study of the text. The author's position has been carefully worked out:

his arguments are well marshalled and lucidly expressed; and they compel respect if they do not always command assent. The book is an excellent contribution to the literature on its subject in English and should be widely used and very useful.

There are some misprints and other slips which should be corrected: p. 15, l. 19 'fail to be' should surely be 'remain' or the like; p. 19, l. 7 'misogynists' should be 'misanthropes'; p. 26, l. 2 'nationalized' should be 'naturalized'; pp. 37, 40, and 41 misprints in the Hebrew, and p. 143, l. 6 in the Syriac; p. 41, n. 7 for *Δεββων* read *Αεββων* and for *Χριστοῦ* read *χρηστοῦ*. By a curious mischance Syriac nouns in the Emphatic state are regularly printed with a short instead of a long *a* in the final syllable.

T. W. MANSON.

University of Manchester.

Lane COOPER: *Experiments in Education*. Pp. viii+176. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press (London: Milford), 1943. Cloth, 15s. 6d. net.

THE author of this book is Professor of English at Cornell, and that fact gives the more interest and weight to his views on the place of the Classics in Higher Education. He believes uncompromisingly in them and in thorough mastery of some field of study—a theory not much in favour in his own country but one which, as he quaintly says, 'still lives wherever, as in Scotland or St. Joseph, Minnesota, there is any literary education worthy of the name'. He himself has 'attempted always to combine the tradition of the Bible and the Classics and the Middle Ages with the study of English Literature'. The book comprises various essays and interesting examples of courses in General Reading, in English, in Translations of the Classics, etc. The syllabus in these is carefully and thoroughly worked out. We in this country are making a start on the study of the Classics in translation, and it is essential to develop it, if classical influences are not to disappear over wide areas of national life. But the effectiveness of such courses largely depends on their nature, and Professor Cooper's practical suggestions will be a real help to their planning. In his list of suggested translations (generally excellent) we miss Cookson's *Aeschylus* and the Mr. Sheppard's *Oedipus Tyrannus*.

R. W. LIVINGSTONE.

Corpus Christi College, Oxford.

## SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS

### CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY

XXXVIII. 4: OCTOBER, 1943

B. W. Meritt, *The Early Athenian Tribute Lists*: (1) studies the postscript of List 1, the prescript of List 15, and the prescript of List 8, supporting his assignment of List 8 to 447/6 B.C.; (2) criticizes

Dow's scheme (*C.P.* xxxviii. 20-7) for the disposition of lists on the first *stèle*. V. M. Scamuzza, *Livy in the Ara Pietatis Augustae*: conjectures that the three figures watching Claudius' procession on the Della Valle-Medici relief are Virgil, Horace, and Livy. J. A. O. Larsen, *Tituli Asiae Minoris*, ii.508 (II): discusses the bearing of the inscription

on the history of the institutions of the Lycian League. Grace B. Ruckh, *Longinus' Criticism of Theocritus*: explains 33. 4 πλὴν ὁλίγων τῶν ἐξωθεν as suggested to L. by Theon's scholia. Marian Harman suggests Dio as Milton's source for a Greek proverb. B. Einarson identifies the χρύσειον κλῶνα of A.P. iv. 1. 47 with the δαίμων μέγα of Dioscorides. Anne Turner connects the story of Tiberius in Suet. Tib. 57. 2 with *Aen.* ii. 535-40.

## XXXIX. 1: JANUARY, 1944

F. W. Householder, *Παροδεία*: examines the history of the words παροδεία, -ωδή, and -ωδία and classifies instances. H. J. Loane, *Vespasian's Spice Market*: suggests that the erection of the Horrea Piperataria was connected with a state-trade in spices and perfumes under Vespasian and discusses other forms of tribute in kind. Robert Schlaifer, *The Attic Association of the Μεσσηνιοί*: concludes that the association was not territorial but was based on real or fictitious consanguinity. H. C. Youtie, *Diplomatic Notes on Michigan Ostraca*: discusses, with illustrations, (1) the use of blank forms, (2) grain measures, (3) the drachma and its parts, (4) fractions, (5) the contour of an ostrakon. Meriwether Stewart offers a supplement of P. Oxy. 668. 188-90 which agrees with Frontinus' account and adds a new fact to our knowledge of M. Lepidus Porcina. F. Solmsen, *Cicero, N.D. 3. 53 ff.*: 53-60 is a refutation, not an account, of Euhemerism, but Cicero seems to have forgotten the purpose for which it was introduced. B. L. Ullman, *Dionysius on Saturnian Verse*: in *Ant. Rom.* 7. 72. 11 Post's emendation ἀμέτροις (for ἀμα τοῖς) should be interpreted 'in bad metre' and referred to Saturnians, of which the word is used by Charisius I. 228. 1 K. A. K. Nichols, *The December Consualia*: the winter *Consualia* probably celebrated the olive-harvest as the summer celebrated the grain-harvest.

## XXXIX. 2: APRIL, 1944

J. W. Swain, *Antiochus Epiphanes and Egypt*: examines A.'s foreign policy in the light of conditions in the Seleucid Empire. G. H. McCurdy, *Had the Danaid Trilogy a Social Problem?*: the problem of the trilogy is not sociological (as G. Thomson supposes) but dramatic; the *Supplices* is a tragedy, not the solution of a legal question. B. L. Charney, *Ellipsis of the Pronoun in Seneca*: analyses S.'s practice and discusses additions and corrections which do not take it into account. J. A. Scott, *The Forbidden Dieresis in Homer*: criticizes Monro's rule that Homer does not allow diaeresis after the third foot. F. M. Heichelheim, *Supply Bases for Caracalla's Parthian Campaign*: the large increase in the number of Syrian mints in A.D. 214-18 was probably intended to decentralize the payment of troops and supply services. G. P. Shipp, *Carina*: the use of *c.* of nuts is figurative: *c.* is not the shell of a nut but its 'keel', i.e. seam. G. P. Shipp, *Ab ovo usque ad mala*: finds in Cic., *ad Fam.* 9. 20. 1, a variation from traditional order of courses. G. P. Shipp, *A Latin Idiom and Pliny, Ep. 4. 2. 2*: quotes Latin exx.

of the idiom by which a compound verb is repeated by means of its simple form and so explains *emancipat . . . mancipat* in *Ep.* 4. 2. 2.

## AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

LXIV. 3: JULY, 1943

W. A. Heidel, *Hecataeus and Xenophanes*: after examining these philosophers' work in relation to the Milesian school, and assessing their original contributions in Geography, History, and Theology, concludes that the former is a satirical rationalist, the latter an earnest reformer. J. Fontenrose, *The Garden of Phoebe*: argues against E. L. Highbarger's theory that there was a widely established tradition of an Eastern Garden of the Sun. C. A. Robinson, Jr., *Alexander's Deification*: suggests that this was a purely political measure ordered, or permitted, as the best solution of the difficult problem of Alexander's relation to his Greek subjects. E. A. Thompson, *Ammianus' Account of Gallus Caesar*: seeks to show that the writer's obvious prejudice led him to suppress all mention of such good qualities as military capacity, genuine interest in the lower classes, and devout Christianity, which Gallus unquestionably possessed. H. J. Wolff, *The ΔΙΚΗ ΒΑΒΥΛΩΝ in Demosthenes Or. lv*: holds that the action was correctly described as *atimelos* since it was based on a law prescribing a fixed penalty for proved damage by water, in lieu of the surrender of the defendant's estate, which could originally have been demanded. G. Norwood, *Pindar, Nemean, vii. 31-5*: for βαθίων (or βαθίων) reads βαθίων, to be taken with λόγον in the previous line, and for τοι suggests τῷ in the sense of 'therefore'. L. Spitzer, *Pageant = Latin Pagina*: maintains that the Anglo-Latin *pagina* is a natural semantic development from the stem *pag* (seen in *pangere, compages, impago*) since its root meaning is 'something well constructed and prepared for a purpose'. L. Spitzer, *Parlascio, Perilasio*: suggests that *parlascio* (Florentine name for the Municipal Council Chamber) properly meant *Mauerumgang*, i.e. a covered way along the walls of a city, and should be connected with *περιελασις*, used by Herodotus in that sense. F. M. Heichelheim, *Numismatic Evidence of the Battle of Lysimachia*: states that *Numismata Hellenica, Kings*, p. 14, no. 8 (W. M. Leake), now in the Fitzwilliam Museum, is a restrike of coinage minted at Lysimachia to satisfy the sudden demand after the battle in the regained Macedonian territory. C. R. Thompson, *Some Greek and Grecised Words in Renaissance Latin*: suggests that *morosophus* came to Sir Thomas More not direct from Lucian, but from the *Moriae Encomium* of his friend Erasmus, and adds further examples of such formations from the latter's writings.

## LXIV. 4: OCTOBER 1943

W. F. Snyder, *When was the Alexandrian Calendar Established?* Deduces 30 B.C. as the year in which this reform took place. L. Pearson, *Three Notes on the Funeral Oration of Pericles*:

under  
ii. 42  
and  
tion  
ii. 43  
(ισόρ)  
Mac  
thom.  
addi  
of th  
Migr  
infor  
Schol  
E. F.  
tion:  
about  
reform  
of ho  
Prose  
λογί  
were  
logue  
on Ve  
reject  
(Phys  
as pa  
existe  
'The  
Year  
Psych  
Greek  
dotus:  
a stro  
ἀμαθ  
Stuart  
gests t  
was de  
since t  
a com  
Censor  
Nobili

TRA

L. R.  
traces  
tions up  
History  
distinct  
of 'trag  
practice  
nistic hi  
R. G. K  
a deriv  
Dancers  
ence in  
H. C. Y  
notes on

understands δόξη in the sense of ill repute in ii. 42. 4 (τῆς δόξης μᾶλλον ἢ τοῦ δόους ἀπηλλάγησαν), and takes λόγος to mean both 'reasoned calculation' (σκοποῦντες μὴ λόγῳ μόνῳ τὴν ὠφελαν, ii. 43. 1), and 'body of general ideas' or 'tradition' (ισόρροπος . . . ὁ λόγος τῶν ἔργων, ii. 42. 2). G. H. Macurdy, *The Dawn Songs in Rhesus and Phaethon*: uses the similarities in the two odes as additional evidence for the Euripidean authorship of the *Rhesus*. D. W. Prakken, *The Boeotian Migration*: concludes that the source of the information in Strabo (ix. 2. 3) as well as Tzetzes, *Schol. ad Lycoph.* 1374, p. 379. 28, is Hellenicus. E. F. D'Arms, *The Classes of the Servian Constitution*: argues that these arrangements were made about 444/443 B.C., in connexion with the army reforms of that period, especially the introduction of hoplite tactics. S. Wilcox, *Isocrates' Genera of Prose*: argues that the λόγοι *repárelas* καὶ *ψευδο-λογίας* *μεσοί*, mentioned in the *Panathenaicus*, were philosophical works, i.e. paradoxical dialogues, treatises, and *encomia*. J. Katz, *Aristotle on Velocity in the Void*: maintains that Aristotle rejected the idea of equal velocity for all bodies (*Physic.* Δ 8. 216<sup>a</sup>20) not in error but deliberately as part of his reasoned argument against the existence of a void. S. Maxwell, *An Addition to 'The First Idyll of Moschus in Imitations to the Year 1800'*: cites Shakerley Marmion's *Cupid and Psyche*, and estimates its debt to the original Greek. J. W. Cohoon, *A Textual Item in Herodotus*: in i. 33 (Croesus and Solon) punctuates with a strong stop after οὐδενός, and reads ἀμαθὴς for ἀμαθία, making the word refer to Solon. M. Stuart, *Pliny Historia Naturalis*, xxxi. 41: suggests that *Aufeia*, as a name for the *Aqua Marcia*, was derived from a contraction of *Aemilia-Fulvia*, since the aqueduct of Q. Marcius Rex was merely a completion of work begun in 179 B.C. by the Censors M. Aemilius Lepidus and M. Fulvius Nobilior.

# TRANSACTIONS OF THE AMERICAN PHILOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION

LXXIII: 1942

L. R. Taylor, *Caesar and the Roman Nobility*: traces the development of Caesar's political relations up to the first 'triumvirate'. B. L. Ullman, *History and Tragedy*: in the light of Aristotle's distinction between the two, considers the concept of 'tragical history' as found in the theory and practice of Isocratean, Peripatetic, and Hellenistic historians, with special reference to Polybius. R. G. Kent, *The Etymology of Latin sine*: proposes a derivation from \**sēd-ne*. L. B. Lawler, *Four Dancers in the Birds of Aristophanes*: the reference in 266-93 is to four 'specialty dancers'. H. C. Youtie, *Parerga Ostracologica*: four critical notes on *Ostr. Mich.* i. G. M. Kirkwood, *Two*

*Structural Features of Sophocles' Electra*: argues that this play is an adaptation and expansion of the part of *Electra* in the *Choephoroi*. F. O. Copley, *On the Origin of Certain Features of the Paracausithyron*: lists four conventional features of the shut-out lover's lament. J. N. Hough, *The Reverse Comic Foil in Plautus*: the later plays have more frequent instances where a character of lower social rank acts as foil for the jest of a *senex* or *adulescens*. J. W. Spaeth, *Persius on Epicurus*: *Sat.* 3. 83-4 (*aegroti veleris*) is a reference to Epicurus. M. St.-A. Woodside, *Vespasian's Patronage of Education and the Arts*: the patronage, such as it was, aimed at promoting the great task of reconstruction which faced this emperor. D. M. Robathan, *Domitian's 'Midas-touch'*: produces evidence to show that Domitian was spending vast sums on building right up to the end of his reign. K. von Fritz, *Pompey's Policy before and after the Outbreak of the Civil War of 49 B.C.*: contends that Pompey's decision to evacuate Italy in the event of war with Caesar was taken half a year before the war broke out, and that the loss of a large army at Corfinium was due to his keeping this decision too long concealed. M. B. Ogle, *The Apple of the Eye*: the phrase arose in the ninth century from a mistaken reading of *pupilla* (as *pila*) *oculi*. F. Solmsen, *Eratosthenes as Platonist and Poet*: a review of the fragments of E.'s *Platonicus* and *Hermes*. F. W. Lenz, *ΕΘΟΣ ΔΕΥΤΕΡΗ ΦΥΣΙΣ*: seeks to identify a fragment of Democritus in Julian. W. H. Stahl, *Astronomy and Geography in Macrobius*: reconsiders the relevant sections of Macrobius' *Commentary on Cicero's Somnium Scipionis*. J. Holzworth, *Hugutio's Derivationes and Arnulfus' Commentary on Ovid's Fasti*: these twelfth-century commentaries have a common source. F. L. Shisler, *The Technique of the Portrayal of Joy in Greek Tragedy*. W. H. Kirk, *The Syntax of the Gerund and the Gerundive*: discussion based largely on Buck and Brugmann. A. Turyn, *The Sapphic Ostrakon*: revised text and interpretation. M. L. Patterson, *Rome's Choice of Magistrates during the Hannibalic War*: the need for competent leadership outweighed the influence of the political cliques. N. J. De Witt, *The Non-Political Nature of Caesar's Commentaries*: the *de bello Gallico* is not propaganda but casually written, highly stylized material intended for the use of future historians. H. W. Miller, *A Note on ὁ κωμικός in Eustathius*: on E.'s references to Aristophanes. H. E. Barnes, *Katharsis in the Enneades of Plotinus*: the purification of the soul is not a mere negative separation from matter but a spiritual renewal. I. S. Ryberg, *Tacitus' Art of Innuendo*: particularly in the case of Tiberius, Tacitus uses a technique for conveying impressions for which he is unwilling to take responsibility as an historian. J. J. H. Savage, *Insula Avallonia*: on the medieval legend and its connexion with Virgil. *Proceedings*.

## BOOKS RECEIVED

*Excerpts or extracts from periodicals and collections will not be included unless they are also published separately.*

- Amyx* (D. A.) *Corinthian Vases in the Hearst Collection at San Simeon.* (University of California Publications in Classical Archaeology, Vol. I, No. 9.) Pp. 207-40; 5 plates. Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press (London: Cambridge University Press), 1943. Paper, 50 c.
- Björck* (G.) *Apsyrtus, Julius Africanus etl 'hippiatrique grecque* (Uppsala Universitets Åvsskrift, 1944: 4.) Pp. 70. Uppsala: Lundequist, 1944. Paper, 3 kr.
- Bowra* (C. M.) *Sophoclean Tragedy.* Pp. vii+384. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1944. Cloth, 20s. net.
- Edelstein* (L.) *The Hippocratic Oath: Text, Translation, and Interpretation.* (Supplements to the Bulletin of the History of Medicine, No. 1.) Pp. vii+64. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1943. Paper, \$1.25.
- Excavations at Dura-Europos: Final Report IV. Part I, Fasc. 1: The Green Glazed Pottery.* By Nicholas Toll. Pp. 95; 20 plates, 30 text-figures. New Haven: Yale University Press (London: Milford), 1943. Paper, 13s. 6d. net.
- Francis Macdonald Cornford, 1874-1943.* (From Proceedings of the British Academy, Vol. XXIX.) Pp. 12. London: Milford, 1944. Paper, 2s. net.
- Greene* (W. C.) *Moirai. Fate, Good, and Evil in Greek Thought.* Pp. ix+450. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press (London: Milford), 1944. Cloth, \$5.
- Harvard Studies in Classical Philology.* Volume LIII. Pp. 184. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press (London: Milford), 1942. Cloth, \$2.
- Jasny* (N.) *Wheat Prices and Milling Costs in Classical Rome.* (Wheat Studies of the Food Research Institute, XX. 4.) Pp. 138-70. Stanford, Calif.: Food Research Institute, 1944. Paper, \$1.
- Jones* (C. W.) *Baedae Opera de Temporibus.* Pp. xiii+416. Cambridge, Mass.: Mediaeval Academy of America, 1943. Cloth, \$8.
- Leonard* (W. E.) and *Smith* (S. B.) *T. Lucreti Cari de Rerum Natura libri sex.* Edited with Introduction and Commentary. Pp. ix+886. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1942. Cloth, \$5.
- Livingstone* (R. W.) *Plato and Modern Education.* Pp. 36. Cambridge: University Press, 1944. Paper, 1s. net.
- Markman* (S. D.) *The Horse in Greek Art.* (Johns Hopkins University Studies in Archaeology, No. 35.) Pp. xvii+211; 46 plates. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press (London: Milford), 1943. Cloth, 30s. net.
- Metzger* (B. M.) *The Saturday and Sunday Lessons from Luke in the Greek Gospel Lectionary.* Pp. 101. Chicago: University of Chicago Press (London: Cambridge University Press), 1944. Paper, \$1.50.
- Michigan Papyri, Vol. V. Papyri from Tebtunis, Part II.* By E. M. Husselman, A. E. R. Boak, and W. F. Edgerton. Pp. xix+446; 6 plates. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press (London: Milford), 1944. Cloth, \$5.
- Minns* (E. H.) *The Art of the Northern Nomads.* (British Academy Annual Lecture on Aspects of Art, 1942.) Pp. 54; map, 28 plates. London: Milford, 1944. Paper, 10s. 6d. net.
- Oldfather* (W. A.) and others. *Studies in the Text Tradition of St. Jerome's Vitae Patrum.* Pp. ix+566. Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois Press, 1943. Cloth, \$14.50.
- Plumpe* (J. C.) *Mater Ecclesia. An Inquiry into the Concept of the Church as Mother in Early Christianity.* (Studies in Christian Antiquity, No. 5.) Pp. xxi+149; 4 plates. Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1943. Paper, \$2.
- Sir Stephen Gaselee, 1882-1943.* (From Proceedings of the British Academy, Vol. XXIX.) Pp. 23. London: Milford, 1943. Paper, 3s. 6d. net.
- Smith* (H. R. W.) *The Hearst Hydria: an Attic Footnote to Corinthian History.* (University of California Publications in Classical Archaeology, Vol. I, No. 10.) Pp. 241-90; 5 plates. Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press (London: Cambridge University Press), 1944. Paper, 75c.
- Smyly* (J. G.) *Index of Contributors to Hermathena, 1873-1943.* Pp. 29. Dublin: Hodges, Figgis & Co. (London: Longmans). Paper, 5s. net.
- Taubenschlag* (R.) *The Law of Greco-Roman Egypt in the Light of the Papyri.* Pp. xv+488. New York: Herald Square Press, 1944. Cloth, \$12.50.
- Yale Classical Studies.* Volume VIII. Pp. 178. New Haven: Yale University Press (London: Milford), 1942. Cloth, 13s. 6d. net.



ed

ohns  
logy,  
ore:  
1943.

nday  
tion-  
cago  
ress),

unis,  
oak,  
ates.  
Press

nads.  
pects  
don:

Text  
Pp.  
linois

into  
Early  
quity,  
gton,  
Press,

Pro-  
IX.).  
aper,

Attic  
ity of  
ology,  
keley,  
ndon:  
, 75c.  
term-  
edges,  
aper,

oman  
+ 488.  
Cloth,

. 178.  
ndon: